

HE POU HE'E I KA WAWĀ:
SLIPPING INTO THE TUMULT OF LIFE AND POLITICS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

DECEMBER 2016

By

Lu'ukia Archer

Dissertation Committee:

Noenoe Silva, Chairperson
Jonathan Goldberg-Hiller
Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua
Leilani Basham
Noelani Arista
Niklaus Schweizer

Copyright © 2016 Luukia Archer
All rights reserved

This dissertation is dedicated to my kūpuna, Frank and Leilani Thompson, both of whom laid the groundwork for the path I follow in this life. And to my three kaikamahine, Ēwelei‘ula, ‘Oaka‘ōlali and Noelohuliau, who expand our mo‘okū‘auhau everyday through their words, thoughts and actions. E ho‘oulu i ka lāhui Hawai‘i!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the tireless support and encouragement of a number of individuals. I would first like to mahalo my dissertation committee. Each member of the committee has contributed significantly to the development of my thoughts on many of the topics addressed in this dissertation and I am eternally grateful for all of the support they have offered over many years. I would especially like to thank my chair Noenoe Silva who has advocated for my success since I was an undergraduate student and expended incalculable energy over the last six months to see me through this final step in my academic journey. Her guidance, mentorship, and wisdom have been a constant source of inspiration and I hope that my contribution is a positive reflection of all that she has provided for the lāhui and me. I would also like to express my mahalo for kumu Leilani Basham who has fostered my intellectual and cultural growth for more than a decade. Mahalo ā nui for your critical insights and review of my work, answering my late night calls, responding to my random text messages, and coddling my vulnerable sense of self when it was most needed. Nui ke aloha iā ‘oe. I am also extremely grateful to Jon Goldberg-Hiller for his instantaneous email responses, for taking the time out of his busy writing schedule to read and critique my chapters, and for pushing and challenging my thinking in political theory for many years and particularly in the last six months.

I also want to mahalo my amazing friends Mary-Lindsey Correa and Genai Keli‘ikuli who have kept me going and struggled along with me during the entirety of my doctoral studies. Mahalo to you both for answering my crazy questions about God, letting me bounce ideas off you and dealing with my near constant freak-outs over the

last few months. You have both been an immeasurable support system and I am lucky to have such intelligent, thoughtful, and caring friends.

Thank you to my 84 and Sunny team, Brandi Martin and Nai'a Lewis, for providing technological and creative support. You both made the defense a much less stressful process and I am truly grateful for your assistance and your incredible brains.

I am indebted to my mother, Iris Thompson, for her love and unwavering support of my endeavors. Mahalo to you and Kevin for providing a loving, nurturing, and stimulating home for my kids during the summers so that I could finally finish this dissertation.

Thanks as well to my father, Kelly Archer, for always checking in on me and for providing gifts of food so I didn't have to cook!

I am profoundly grateful to my husband, Sterling Kini Wong, for sacrificing his time, his work, and his sanity so that I could finish this dissertation. Mahalo for taking on the bulk of the parental duties over the last few months and for doing so in such a loving and supportive manner (as a husband should). Most of all though I am grateful for your ability to challenge status quo ideas, question embedded views and perspectives, dispute illogical claims and provoke my own thinking on the topics that greatly impact our lāhui.

And lastly, to my three beloved daughters who sacrificed bedtime stories, help with homework and afternoon surf sessions so that I could be Doctor Mom. I am inspired everyday by the little humans you are becoming.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy) as a framework that promotes distinct ways of thinking about the world and structures our engagement in it. Throughout the dissertation, I engage sex, procreation, and birth, concepts inherent to mo‘okū‘auhau, and contend that these themes result in the expression of practices wherein life is both the object and core of politics making it essential for ali‘i (chiefs) to manage in order to support a thriving population. Mō‘ī (king) David La‘amea Kalākaua’s reign provides rich investigative terrain for this analysis and the dissertation considers the 1874 election period, the profound impact of the cosmogonic genealogy Kumulipo to his leadership, and his motto Ho‘oulu Lāhui (increase the nation) as useful examples in constructing mo‘okū‘auhau as a framework wherein ‘ōiwi (native) theoretical and methodological positions become accessible. These topics are contextualized within a nineteenth century Hawaiian Kingdom dealing with the ravages of disease and religious intervention that influenced the political actions and motivations of the time.

The political, social, and cultural practices of the past that this dissertation engages were maintained and reshaped throughout the nineteenth century in an extremely transformative period—a period of encounter and collision. New ideologies and methods incorporated with traditional practices acted as strategic responses to these changes and led to syncretic expressions of ‘ōiwi intellectual traditions like mo‘okū‘auhau. Yet, the prominence of mo‘okū‘auhau to the function of ‘ōiwi society within this shifting era was maintained if reconfigured, and given new meaning and modes of expression. In that vein, this dissertation brings mo‘okū‘auhau into conversation with biopolitics and

biopower in an effort to underline life as the core and object of ‘ōiwi politics intent on producing a thriving ‘ōiwi population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
Chapter 1	1
‘Ōlelo Ho‘ākāka	1
Mo‘okū‘auhau—Relationship Making and Organization	9
Biopower/Biopolitics—Life and Death, Power and Politics	13
Kalākaua—Building Political Power through the Kumulipo and Beyond	23
Chapter 2	34
Mo‘okū‘auhau: Life and Power in Overlapping Conceptual Landscapes	34
Changing Traditions	42
Pō and Ao In Transformation (and Collision)	61
Ola Hou and Eternal Life	78
Chapter 3	92
Ho‘oulu Lāhui: Sex, Procreation and Production	92
Ho‘oulu Lāhui, Sex and Disease	98
Ho‘oulu Lāhui and Production	104
Ho‘oulu Lāhui and Ahahui Hooulu a Hoola	108
Conclusion	113
Chapter 4	116
Ho‘oulu Lāhui: Perpetuating ‘Ōiwi Bodies of Knowledge	116
Ka Papa Kū‘auhau o Nā Ali‘i	120
Adolf Bastian and the International Context	144
Increasing the Nation	154
Conclusion	157
Chapter 5	160
Ka Panina Mana‘o	160
The Future in the Past: Projects and Possibilities	162
Ka Hopena	165
References	168

Chapter 1

‘Ōlelo Ho‘ākāka

In ‘ōiwi (native) intellectual traditions mo‘okū‘auhau¹ are considered one of the most secure methods for transmitting knowledge. The techniques of transmission are influenced by the requirements of oral traditions—to perpetuate large quantities of information from one generation to the next. We have inherited the information contained in ‘ōiwi intellectual traditions, like mo‘okū‘auhau, in “oral, auditory, written, and published forms” across shifting periods of time and experiences of exchange, encounter, and innovation (Arista 2010c, 15). In the past, methods were developed to maintain the accuracy of information secured within oral traditions and intellectuals were trained in a practical and well-organized educational system that sustained these methods of transmission. In order to perpetuate the wisdom contained in mo‘okū‘auhau, ‘ōiwi intellectuals became “specialists who were essentially living libraries of knowledge who cataloged, stored, and kept sacred information available upon request” (Kikiloi 2010, 78). Mo‘okū‘auhau function as the framework in which this information is perceived, perpetuated, and reproduced “extending in vertical, horizontal, and diagonal directions through time” ultimately connecting generations of ‘ōiwi to the human, natural, and spiritual environments in which we exist (Brown 2016, 27).

This dissertation examines mo‘okū‘auhau, and specifically the Kumulipo, as a framework that promotes distinct ways of thinking about the world and structures our engagement in it. The Kumulipo belongs to a precise category of genealogy referred to as mele ko‘ihonua (cosmogonic genealogy) that highlights the extensive production and

¹ I use mo‘okū‘auhau and genealogy interchangeably throughout the dissertation.

expanse of knowledge and information incorporated within genealogical compositions. Yet, it is but one type of mo‘okū‘auhau in which an ‘ōiwi worldview is illuminated. Marie Alohalani Brown argues, “The kuamo‘o (backbone) of Hawaiian culture is mo‘okū‘auhau. We perceive the world genealogically—everything is relational...as an ‘Ōiwi theoretical and philosophical construct, it stands for relationality” (2016, 27). In line with Brown’s assertion, I engage mo‘okū‘auhau in this dissertation as a term inclusive of a variety of genres and as a mode expressing the relational aspects between categories—mele ko‘ihonua, mo‘olelo (story, history), mele ma‘i (genital chants), mele inoa (name chants)—as they have overlapping qualities. For Brown, “a mele ko‘ihonua such as the Kumulipo, which is a genealogy and a sanctifying prayer for an ali‘i, may inform mo‘olelo, which in turn may inform ka‘ao” (17). Or, as John Charlot indicates, “Genealogy provided, therefore, the classical framework of the historical narrative and was filled out with the related stories” (2005, 492). This dissertation is not a comprehensive study of ‘ōiwi genealogy. Rather, it contributes a set of interpretations based primarily on the Kumulipo and its significance to the reign of Mō‘ī (king) David La‘amea Kalākaua in an effort to express the potential in analyzing ‘ōiwi politics through a mo‘okū‘auhau framework. Of consequence to this study is the arrangement of mo‘okū‘auhau in fluid ways, as specific and diffuse, as applied to a particular ali‘i (chief) or to the class of ali‘i and as an embodiment of the lāhui (nation) at large.

Throughout the dissertation, I engage sex, procreation, and birth, concepts inherent to mo‘okū‘auhau, and contend that these themes result in the expression of practices wherein life is both the object and core of politics making it essential for ali‘i to manage in order to support a thriving population. Mō‘ī David La‘amea Kalākaua’s reign,

which spanned the years 1874 to 1891, provides rich investigative terrain for this analysis and the dissertation considers the 1874 election period, the profound impact of the Kumulipo to his leadership, and his motto Ho‘oulu Lāhui (increase the nation) as useful examples in interpreting mo‘okū‘auhau as a framework wherein ‘ōiwi theoretical and methodological positions are revealed. Moreover, I contextualize these examples within the political contexts of a 19th century Hawaiian Kingdom dealing with the ravages of disease and religious intervention that influenced the attitudes, actions and motivations during this time period.

The political, social, and cultural practices of the past that this dissertation engages were maintained and reshaped throughout the 19th century in an extremely transformative period—a period of encounter and collision. Economic and political systems as well as moral and legal attitudes belonging to different groups that traversed the ‘ōiwi landscape emphasize the heterogeneity of the period under study (Arista 2010c, xiv). Blending ideas and appropriating tools of modernity worked to maintain sovereignty over the islands amid a number of foreign attempts to gain control. New ideologies and methods incorporated with traditional practices acted as strategic responses to the shifting times and led to syncretic expressions of ‘ōiwi intellectual traditions (Beamer 2014, 8-9). Yet, the prominence of mo‘okū‘auhau to the function of ‘ōiwi society within this shifting period was maintained if reconfigured, and given new meaning and modes of expression. In that vein, this dissertation brings mo‘okū‘auhau into conversation with 20th and 21st century notions of biopolitics and biopower in an effort to underline life as the core and object of ‘ōiwi politics intent on producing a thriving ‘ōiwi population.

“Life” and “politics” the two terms that form biopolitics are also the concepts that resound in mo‘okū‘auhau; compositions that are life giving, life affirming, but also function to establish, perpetuate, produce, and influence politics and power. Biopower represents a move away from traditional sovereign power formulated in European contexts that “took life and let live” and into the terrain of managing life, its processes and the productivity of populations (Foucault 1978; Foucault 2003, 247). Biopolitics generally describes “a politics of the body or, to be precise, politics for the entire body of the population” (Forti 2006, 9). Likewise, mo‘okū‘auhau, and in particular the Kumulipo, is conceived in this dissertation as a system that encouraged reproduction and managed productivity in relation to and representative of the ‘ōiwi population under the purview of Kalākaua’s sovereign authority.

Theory and Method

There is much to learn in the confluence of mo‘okū‘auhau and biopolitics. They are both encounters between life and politics, they both enact political strategies intent on managing life and its biological processes, and they are both at the foreground of struggles over sovereignty in the nineteenth century Hawaiian Kingdom. On one hand this confluence makes way for my contention that mo‘okū‘auhau is an ‘ōiwi form of biopower grounded in ‘ōiwi ontologies and epistemologies that apprehend life and power in distinct ways. In as much as Euro-American forms of biopolitics diffuse sovereign power and emphasizes power in its relation to populations, sexuality, and the life of the body, I argue that mo‘okū‘auhau highlights sovereign power through the privileging of those very same topics. On the other hand I contend the juncture between mo‘okū‘auhau and biopolitics clarifies the ‘ōiwi and colonial deployments of biopower prior to and

during Kalākaua’s reign. I assert that for ‘ōiwi it was a method used to maintain authority and perpetuate ‘ōiwi sovereignty. Conversely, in the historical examples addressed in this dissertation, haole (foreigners) with colonial motivations used forms of biopower to gain or wrest power through colonial imposition. The dissertation argues that the difference in the expressions of biopower is firmly grounded in divergent worldviews and conceptions of life. I argue that an ‘ōiwi view of life envisioned through a framework of mo‘okū‘ahau focused on interconnection, relational qualities, and multiplicity within a polytheistic cosmology. In contrast, the colonial mindset worked within “the vicious cycle of monotheism” suffering the recurring “temptation to make the world over into one model” through domination and exploitation of resources (Esposito 2013a, 63-65). The execution of biopower analyzed in this dissertation makes clear the differentiation based on these divergent worldviews. Although there is much to be gained theoretically from focusing on both ‘ōiwi and haole expressions of biopower during Kalākaua’s reign, the dissertation privileges ‘ōiwi articulations as they improvised new forms and expressions of sovereignty in their rapidly changing world.²

Grappling with the meeting of life and politics oriented primarily to Euro-American histories, experiences, and religious foundations, biopolitical scholarship beginning with Michel Foucault’s seminal texts, has been attuned to an assessment of totalitarianism, eugenics, and racism, particularly as it functioned within the Nazi regime. The power over life, biopower “is that which guarantees the continuous living of the human species” through the management of life processes, which resonates with the basic function of mo‘okū‘auhau (Campbell 2008, xxi). However, in biopolitical scholarship

² An in depth study of haole expressions of biopower during this time period is however an important site for future research.

focused on European regimes of power, and in particular the Third Reich, that living is often framed in relation to “death that is necessary to preserve life, of a life nourished by the deaths of others” (Esposito 2008, 39). In contrast, I argue that mo‘okū‘auhau envisions and encapsulates the sexual and procreative energies that produce and protect life in its various manifestations, both human and non-human. For example, pō as elemental darkness is gendered and sexual with the ability to birth life in the form of coral polyps. Likewise, plants born on land to this same elemental darkness have an embedded responsibility to guard and protect their counterpart born in the sea. This is similar to the human relationship between kua‘ana (older sibling) and kaikaina (younger sibling) born to mākua (parents), responsibilities to one another that are fundamental to and systematically represented in mo‘okū‘auhau. Death is also a part of the political (and thus, lived) landscape, but as argued in the dissertation it is perceived in differently within an ‘ōiwi worldview. Death is not an end of the material, spiritual, or political, it is a transition from one realm of being to another. Moreover, I contend that in mo‘okū‘auhau death potentially “nourishes” life through the perpetuation of mana that empowers both living and future generations. It carries forward from one living being to another, the material, spiritual, and political aspects of the deceased, rather than ‘cleansing’ the living of what defiled it, as in the genocide perpetrated by the Nazi regime. Stripped to its two basic concepts—life and politics—and reformulated in relation to mo‘okū‘auhau and an ‘ōiwi ontology, a life affirming vision of biopolitics may be possible. This dissertation seeks to illuminate the potential of this vision through an articulation of mo‘oku‘auhau.

Despite the pervasive engagement with death, the desire for a life affirming politics is a perspective shared by a number of scholars working in the field of biopolitics attempting to escape the burden of death found in the often ambiguous encounter between life and politics. The perpetuation of life through sex and procreation in balance with death and the preservation of mana are integral and intentional foundations of a political framework of mo‘okū‘auhau that may lead to the conception of an affirmative biopolitics that recognizes the vitality of all life and its interconnection, that recognizes “harming one part of life or one life harms all lives” (Esposito 2008, xl). Jodi Byrd contends, in regard to indigenous critical theory, that it “exist[s] in its best form when it centers itself within indigenous epistemologies and the specificities of the communities and cultures from which it emerges and then looks outward to engage European philosophical, legal, and cultural traditions in order to build upon all the allied tools available” (2011, xxix-x). Similarly, this dissertation begins with mo‘okū‘auhau and looks outward to biopower and biopolitics to build on the historical and intellectual foundations I argue are already present within ‘ōiwi thought worlds.

Though the dissertation is an investigation of the past preserved in mo‘okū‘auhau, I endeavor to find the “pathways between contemporary knowledge and the knowledge of our ancestors” as a gesture toward a deeper understanding of current issues and future possibilities (McDougall 2016, 156). The words of Mō‘ī Kamehameha II, Liholiho, speak to the intellectual aptitude and mo‘okū‘auhau foundations the dissertation seeks to integrate in search of these pathways, “Na wai ho‘i ka ‘ole o ke akamai, he alanui i ma‘a i ka hele ‘ia e o‘u mau mākua? Why shouldn’t I know, when it is a road often traveled by my parents?” (Pukui 1983, 251). I appropriate Noelani Arista’s expanded interpretation

of this statement applied to present and future generations of ‘ōiwi in asserting our claims to knowledge, “for as a people collectively we are the inheritors of rich wisdom traditions” (Arista 2010b, 15). Her translation reads, “Who of us is bereft of wisdom, for it is a road frequently traversed by my ancestors” (Ibid).

Like our ‘ōiwi ancestors of the 19th century, we do not live isolated lives cut off from the outside world. We need to pursue, with a discerning eye, all manner of inquiry to find solutions to our struggles in the same strategic and innovative manner as our ancestors. Exploring wisdom traditions like mo‘okū‘auhau, in this way, we recognize our own potential and “come to know the core of our experience and culture as humans in our ‘āina, in this part of the universe” in this space and time (McDougall 2016, 157). Ultimately, the dissertation attempts to expand contemporary ‘ōiwi indigenous theory by giving prominence to mo‘okū‘auhau, as that is its rightful place. Moreover, theorizing from within our own foundations “give us the ontological context from within which we can interpret other stories, teachings and experiences” (Simpson 2011, 32).

Contemporary ‘ōiwi scholarship abounds with genealogical references and mo‘okū‘auhau analyses. I hope to add to this effort while also constructing new ways to consider the relational aspects of mo‘okū‘auhau as a tool for broadening historical perspectives that in turn extend perceptions of our contemporary situations in terms of governance, social relationships, and cultural resurgence.

The following sections further outline the theory and method the dissertation engages—mo‘okū‘auhau and biopower.

Mo‘okū‘auhau—Relationship Making and Organization

The eminent scholar, genealogist, translator, and ethnographer, Mary Kawena Pukui, along with her co-author Samuel Elbert, a linguistic scholar, define mo‘okū‘auhau as a genealogical succession or pedigree (1986, 254). However, breaking down the component parts of the word provides greater comprehension of the layers of meaning embodied in mo‘okū‘auhau and its relation to other words and concepts. Mo‘o for example, has many meanings including, “succession, series, especially a genealogical line” and “story, tradition, legend” (Ibid, 253). A number of words begin with mo‘o—mo‘okū‘auhau, mo‘olelo, mo‘oakua, mo‘olono. Mo‘olelo are stories, tales, history, legends. The word is a contraction of mo‘o and ‘ōlelo, “a succession of talk; all stories were oral, not written” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 254). Mo‘oakua is a “legend or tale concerning gods” or a “godlike lizard” (Ibid). Similarly, mo‘olono means “to hear report after report; succession of reports” (Ibid). The word denotes an inherent relationality through a succession of things said in various contexts. Moreover, mo‘o is visually realized and embodied in its definition as “lizard, reptile of any kind, dragon, serpent,” creatures with a succession of individual vertebrae that extend the backbone beyond the main body (Ibid, 253).

Kū‘auhau is defined as “genealogy, pedigree, lineage, old traditions; genealogist, historian; to recite a genealogy” (Ibid, 171). ‘Auhau adds an additional layer to mo‘okū‘auhau as a “tax, assessment, levy, charge, tariff” as well as its second definition, “femur and humerus bones of the human skeleton” (Ibid, 31). Arista explains the polysemic possibilities of interpreting mo‘okū‘auhau through ‘auhau. She writes, “...‘auhau furnishes another layer of understanding—genealogical connection as bred into

bone. The layered meaning of words leads one to consider the ritualized practice of ceremonial stripping away of the flesh of a chief after his or her death in order to preserve the bones, which are the repository of mana” (Arista 2010c, 92). The spiritual and political power of the ali‘i (and by extension all kānaka) is preserved in mana and passed along a genealogical line to the next generation in a succession similar to the vertebrae of a mo‘o. Arista renders another way of depicting mo‘okū‘auhau that is based on the low lying hau tree whose branches often form in tangled thickets. She offers, “This perhaps is the closest visual somatic and metaphoric inspiration to the genealogies of ali‘i—entangled branchings that spread copiously from a few main roots” (Ibid, 93). The visual presentation of mo‘okū‘auhau through the hau tree also works for considering the intellectual or conceptual entanglements and interconnections that were at play in the 19th century and engaged throughout the dissertation.

Mo‘okū‘auhau generally serve as mnemonic devices housing historically significant information associated with the names that are remembered. Ancestral knowledge is communicated by “virtue of symbolic, allusive, or figurative meanings inscribed” in mo‘okū‘auhau (McDougall 2016, 6). Events in history, space, and time are etched in genealogy and are presented as lessons for living and future generations. In mo‘okū‘auhau, history is recorded, emotions conveyed, and political ideologies maintained. Moreover, mo‘okū‘auhau reveal the linkages between our origins, familial connections, and knowledge of the physical and spiritual realms—the foundational aspects that form our worldviews and identities. Significantly, in cosmogonic genealogies in particular, these elements are rooted in the ability of the human, natural, and spiritual worlds to procreate thus bearing an abundance and variety of life forms in each

generation; life forms that are regulated and protected. Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa emphasizes the importance of mo‘okū‘auhau in her oft-quoted statement, “genealogies are perceived by Hawaiians as an unbroken chain that links those today to the primeval forces—to the mana (spiritual power) that first emerged with the beginning of the world. Genealogies anchor Hawaiians to our place in the universe and give us the comforting illusion of continued existence” (1992, 19-20).

Of principal importance to the function of mo‘okū‘auhau is the mana that exists within it. Kehaunani Abad expands Kame‘eleihiwa’s description of mana and explains that it, “is the power that emanates from the spiritual realm and imbues all things animate and inanimate. From the human perspective it is power that is physically felt, intellectually realized, and intuitively sensed” (2000, 80). Mana is then transferred from one living being to another through mo‘okū‘auhau as Kamana Beamer demonstrates, “...mana informed almost every aspect of ‘Ōiwi society i ka wā kahiko. One received mana primarily through one’s genealogy. In other words, the mana of one’s ancestors is inherited by living descendants” (2014, 19). Although the transference of mana occurred through genealogy, in terms of ali‘i genealogies mana and thus authority could be challenged. Therefore, mo‘okū‘auhau were not uncontested methods of transferring leadership, but were “discussed and debated by the intellectuals of the society” (Charlot 1997, 53). A key example of the debate and discussion surrounding ali‘i genealogies is found in the 1874 election struggle between Kalākaua and dowager Queen Emma discussed later in the dissertation.

Pukui illuminates the expanse of information associated with the genealogical framework and describes the breadth of a genealogist’s knowledge, “Genealogists

learned not only the names and family connections but also the genealogical chants and the stories of each chief and chiefess; where he was born, what he did and all about him” (n.d., 5). The knowledge of these traditions, in turn, emphasize the holistic connections between humans and our natural and spiritual environments as the ontological conditions making possible the practices that emerge from a mo‘okū‘auhau framework.

As the fundamental ‘ōiwi historical genre that perpetuates the flow of mana, the importance of mo‘okū‘auhau is demonstrated by the extension of its use to other subjects, in particular the articulation of the origin of the universe in the Kumulipo (Charlot 2005, 489). Cosmogonic genealogies, like the Kumulipo, “run the gamut thematically from evolution, birth of islands via the mating of gods, and volcanic eruptions to biblically influenced stories” (Oliveira 2014, 1). Within the breadth of knowledge embraced in cosmogonic genealogies one constant remains, the “genealogical relationship between the land, humankind, and the gods” (Ibid, 2).

In ‘ōiwi society, intellectual devices were developed over time to organize the data housed in mo‘okū‘auhau from general divisions to specific details, from the big knowledge to the small. These methods are particularly important for organizing details within cosmogonic genealogies that recount the development of the universe from the simplest elemental life forms to the most complex human beings. Correlative pairs constructed and arranged information comprehensively, effectively constituting a whole “and thus can be used in formulas to express completeness” (Charlot 2005, 247). These pairs include, uka/kai (land/sea), kane/wahine (male/female), luna/lalo (up/down), and pō/ao (darkness/light). Specific details are then placed within the categorical pairs but move fluidly depending on context. Charlot gives the following example expressing the

variability of these “observational categories.” He writes, “a rock when considered as being on land would be grouped in the category of things belonging to uka ‘land’ or male; but the rock might have a female shape as opposed to other male shaped rocks and so could be considered female” (Ibid, 248).

Male and female sexuality, as foundational components of genealogical construction are reflective of a larger system within ‘ōiwi philosophy that appreciates dualism represented as pairs in order to achieve pono, or balance, as well as completeness. Noenoe Silva observes, “In Kanaka genealogies and cosmologies, both male and female forces were always present. Dualisms are abundant, and pono is created and maintained by the balance of complementary forces” and their sexual capacities (2004, 93). Charlot further supports this point, “The ultimate reality was represented by a pair, not by a single source. Hawaiian thinking was consequently dualistic as is evident everywhere in the KL [Kumulipo]” Mo‘okū‘auhau functions as a cultural device developed over time to ensure the preservation, perpetuation, and innovation of knowledge through these organizational methods. Moreover, the training required to memorize, reproduce, and originate mo‘okū‘auhau—particularly cosmogonic genealogies—resulted in “certain habits of mind” that influenced ‘ōiwi social, political, and cultural practices in an atmosphere of shifting 19th century traditions (Ibid).

Biopower/Biopolitics—Life and Death, Power and Politics

An encounter between mo‘okū‘auhau and biopolitics undergirds each chapter of this dissertation in varying degrees, as both are centered on the relations between life and politics. As such, this section introduces biopolitics and the current (and some argue,

inevitable) thanatopolitical turn as broad issues that the dissertation engages. Moreover, this section also underlines the Western and Judeo-Christian orientations that ground contemporary theories of biopower and the “category of the person back to its Christian and Roman origins” (Esposito 2013a, 5). Each chapter of the dissertation takes on offshoots related to the larger biopolitical issues to delve more deeply into the potential of mo‘okū‘auhau in conjunction with biopolitical thought as a way to offer “new perspectives on our contemporary [and historical] situation[s] that make us think differently about the world we live in” (Ibid, 2).

To many, the textual birthplace of biopolitics can be found in the pages of Foucault’s *History of Sexuality, Volume I*, in which he focused on the problem of sexuality for Victorians; a scandalous notion at the time of his writing that “today would more likely elicit shrugs than anything else” (Campbell and Sitze 2013, 4-5). Although Victorian sexuality as a scholarly topic may be uninspiring today, sex and its social, political, and cultural implications, is central to understanding mo‘okū‘auhau and an ‘ōiwi worldview. It is the first stop in formulating the intersection between life and politics within that framework. Moreover, the Christian or puritan attitude toward sex that shaped the sexual practices of the Victorians Foucault saw fit to analyze, is an important consideration for how sex was managed in the 19th century Hawaiian Kingdom against a background of religious and political intervention. It is at this crossroads that sex “becomes legitimately associated with the honor of a political cause: sex, too, is placed on the agenda for the future” (Foucault 1978, 5-6).

Beyond sex however and as the site at which an initial definition of biopolitics can be found, Foucault’s *History of Sexuality, Volume I*, explores an understanding of

biopower that, “designate[s] what brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life” (1978, 143). This form of power arises out of a historical shift in the relationship between sovereign and subject, according to Foucault, a shift from dealing with “legal subjects over whom the ultimate dominion was death” to “the taking charge of life” (Foucault 1978, 142-43). Life, in biopower, is taken charge of through the body and is multivalent in its functionality, inside and outside legal constructs, traditional institutions, and practices, resulting in a normalization of its processes. Whereas sovereignty’s power was exercised “over life without also being able to take hold of it” because its power is tied to the law (Campbell and Sitze 2013, 13).

The struggle between traditional forms of power in sovereignty and a new biopower led to Western society reaching a “threshold of modernity” according to Foucault, wherein the “life of the species is wagered on its own political strategies” enunciating the subjugation of bodies and a control of populations through the regularization of biological processes and a shift away from traditional sovereign power (Ibid, 140-143). Thomas Lemke takes Foucault’s perspective and writes, “Biopolitics is not the expression of a sovereign will but aims at the administration and regulation of life processes on the level of populations. It focuses on living beings rather than on legal subjects—or, to be more precise, it deals with legal subjects that are at the same time living beings” (Lemke 2011, 4). Western man is no longer what he was “for Aristotle: a living animal with the additional capacity for a political existence” he has been transformed in modernity to “an animal whose politics places his existence as a living being in question” (Foucault 1990, 143).

Biopolitics emerged as a new technology of power concerned with birth rates, fertility, mortality, longevity and how they related to economic and political problems and most importantly, how they could be controlled (Foucault 2003, 243). For Foucault, “Biopolitics...deals with the population as a political problem, as a problem that is at once scientific and political, as a biological problem and as power’s problem” (2003, 245). Control was manifested in these processes and “motivated by one basic concern: to ensure populations, to reproduce labor capacity...”(Foucault 1990, 36-7).

With this new technology of power, new mechanisms to express it were developed. Biopolitical mechanisms were no longer only disciplinary or focused on individual bodies by “structuring the parameters and limits of thought and practice, sanctioning and prescribing normal and/or deviant behaviors” (Hardt and Negri 2000, 23). The new mechanisms that emerged with the problem of populations, were regulatory (Foucault 2003, 247). These mechanisms functioned in both public and private institutions and were implicated “in the development of indices of knowledge about populations by expert authorities” (Nadesan 2008, 8). Knowledge and regulation of populations focused on birth rate, public health, housing, and migration (Foucault 1990, 140). Public charities played a role in this regulation as well. Ann Stoler considers Foucault’s assertion of 19th century biopower as unique because it “joins two distinct technologies of power operating at different levels; one addresses the disciplining of individual bodies, the other addresses the ‘global’ regulation of the biological processes of human beings” (Stoler 1995, 33).

Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben argues against Foucault’s assertion that biopower works as the threshold of modernity in contrast to sovereign (or juridical)

power and instead asserts that “the production of a biopolitical body is the original activity of sovereign power” (Agamben 1998, 11). Agamben brings into consideration the terms *zoē* “the simple fact of living common to all living beings (animals, men, or gods)” and *bios* “the form or way of living proper to an individual or group” (Ibid, 10). Agamben describes *zoē* in the classical period of Greek (Western) civilization as existing outside or excluded from the sphere of politics, what marks modernity is its politicization. As such, these terms have come to refer to bare life, biological life, life that simply reproduces (*zoē*) and political life (*bios*), which, in Agamben’s thinking, are anchored in the sovereign state of exception. He writes, “Bare life remains included in politics in the form of the exception, that is as something that is included solely through an exclusion” (Ibid, 13).

The analysis of this exclusion unfolds in the figure of the *homo sacer* found in ancient Roman Law “in which the character of sacredness is tied for the first time to a human life as such” within Western juridical order (Ibid, 45). *Homo sacer* represents a contradictory figure. He is a person who can be killed by anyone “with impunity” but who cannot be put to death in “ritual practices,” he is unworthy of ritual sacrifice. Agamben places the figure of *homo sacer* within a genealogy of modern democracy and its eventual convergence with totalitarian states and the inscription of death through the Nazi camps. Wherein regulation and management of populations, of bodies, became normalizing processes in which an antinomy of life emerged—the spectre of death.

Along these lines, the Third Reich as an expression of modern totalitarianism, Agamben writes, produces “the establishment, by means of the state of exception, of a legal civil war that allows for the physical elimination not only of political adversaries

but of entire categories of citizens who for some reason cannot be integrated into the political system” (Agamben 2005, 2).

The turn toward a politics of death, thanatopolitics, as the negative declension of biopolitics appears largely—though not exclusively—in scholarship focused on totalitarianism, the Nazi regime, and ever more so the issue of terrorism. Timothy Campbell and Adam Sitze in describing the evolution of biopolitical problems in the contemporary period in addition to Nazi war camps— “War on Terror”, HIV/AIDS pandemic, and immortality through technology—argue that, “these crises have produced a context in which there is a demand for scholarly theories that illuminate the relations between life and politics” (Campbell and Sitze 2013, 3). The line drawn between a politics of life and a politics toward death grows thinner and more indistinguishable. Agamben writes, “This line is now in motion and gradually moving into areas other than political life, areas in which the sovereign is entering into an ever more intimate symbiosis with not only the jurist but also with the doctor, the scientist, the expert, and the priest” (Agamben 1998, 72). The zones of indistinction are “paradigms of sovereignty and biopolitics...makes one both the reverse and the complement of the other” (Esposito 2008, 110). Biopolitics transforms “the order of politics” and “stands for a constellation in which modern human and natural sciences and the normative concepts that emerge from them structure political action and determine its goals” (Lemke 2011, 33-34).

As the exemplar in the European context, the Third Reich held “life as its transcendental, race as its subject, and biology as its lexicon...whose final outcome was genocide” (Esposito 2013a, 80-81). Agamben in continuing his analysis of the atrocities

committed by the Third Reich's "integration of medicine and politics...one of the essential characteristics of modern biopolitics" writes, "Euthanasia signals the point at which biopolitics necessarily turns into thanatopolitics" (Agamben 1998, 83). It is in the Nazi focus on life through death, the preservation of the "German people" through the expendability of "all those who threatened its health by simply existing" that the paradox, the aporia, of biopolitics can be read and which has afflicted Euro-American/Western biopolitical scholarship since Foucault's *History of Sexuality* Volume 1 (Ibid, 84).

For Roberto Esposito, the category of immunization is the process through which the two threads of biopolitical declinations become clear—one that is positive and productive, and the other that is lethal and deadly—an affirmative biopolitics and a totalitarian thanatopolitics (Esposito 2008, 46). Esposito's project is to push for an affirmative biopolitics but that can only emerge "after a thoroughgoing deconstruction of the intersection of biology and politics that originates in immunity" (Ibid, ix). The paradigm of immunization Esposito inflects on politics is taken from the body's immune system, which fortifies the body by attacking potential harmful elements. Esposito considers immunity "the power to preserve life" (Ibid). Using the immune system of the body as his interpretative key, Esposito's argument is based in relation to community, as immunity is what protects individual life from the community; "Immunization refers to the particular situation that saves someone from the risk to which the entire community is exposed" (Esposito 2013a, 4-5). The example that opens the relation between immunity and community for Esposito is found in birth, or more specifically pregnancy, which is a compelling comparative site in relation to mo'okū'auhau. Pregnancy and birth functions as an "immunitary framework in which the mother's system of self-defense is reined in

so that the fetus does not become the object of the mother's own immunization" in much the same way an individual is protected from risks posed to the community (Esposito 2008, xxxii). Modern politics, according to Esposito, has taken immunity into its radical dimension, becoming so strong that it begins to destroy that which it was meant to protect resulting in autoimmune deficiencies—attacking its healthy “cells.” Once life has become the object of preservation through immunization it takes an inevitable thanatopolitical turn, making the preservation of life possible only through the killing or death of other life. Totalitarianism, and in particular its Nazi brand, for Esposito like Agamben, is the focus and the exemplar of this paradigm. Yet, Esposito struggles to reverse the thanatopolitical decline and posits instead that “immunity must make itself again the custodian and producer of life” (Ibid, 7). In order to do this, one argument Esposito proposes can be found in a reciprocal relationship between community and immunity, one that must be reconstituted, along with a new formulation of community relationships (Ibid, 8-9). Esposito's move toward an affirmative biopolitics is partially revealed in what “holds us in common.” He writes, “Care...lies at the basis of community. Community is determined by care, and care by community (Ibid, 25-6). Moreover, it is the figure of the ‘other’, other persons, other humans, other life, in community that constitutes “us from deep within” (Ibid, 26). In contemplating community in this way, and considering immunity as that which protects the individuals who make up said community, recognizing that “harming one part of life or one life harms all lives” provides an opening to an affirmative biopolitics that resonates with mo‘okū‘auhau (Esposito 2008, xl). Esposito's struggle for an affirmative biopolitics is framed in a as view of life that is no longer “linked exclusively to those deemed worthy of it” but

inclusive of “every form of life that appears thanks to individuation” (Ibid, xxxii). The interconnection of life, reciprocal aspects in community, and notions of care posited by Esposito are also qualities inherent to the life affirming possibilities in mo‘okū‘auhau.

Miguel Vatter introduces an argument that attempts to reorient a “seemingly inevitable transition from a biopolitics to a thanatopolitics” found in modern Western political experiences and embedded in Judeo-Christian theology through a concept of eternal life (Vatter 2014, 264). This concept is also imagined in mo‘okū‘auhau through the constancy of mana. Vatter suggests that this passage from a focus on life to one on death “may be because the life that is here produced, namely, a zoē that is entirely separate from a bios, is a life that is destined to die: it has death inscribed on it from the very beginning” (Vatter 2014, 263-64). Vatter uses Esposito’s proposition that the power of life be interpreted philosophically, that is as what never perishes, what is eternal, in order to escape the inevitable turn into thanatopolitics (Esposito 2008, 150; Vatter 2014, 264). This proposition traverses mo‘okū‘auhau and its biopolitical tendencies functioning both similarly and in contrast to the ways in which Vatter and Esposito view zoē, bios, and eternal life. In mo‘okū‘auhau life as zoē and bios is inseparable and eternal life is found and perpetuated in mana.

Indeed, overcoming the drift toward thanatopolitics may be possible through a reconceptualization of the body and the valorization of life outside of what Esposito perceives as “some type of organic representation binding it to reality, or at least the potential of a bodily structure” (Esposito 2011) What may impact positively the main folds of biopolitical scholarship in addressing this drift is a perception of life, of what constitutes the body, of politics and power, inclusive of “other voices”—indigenous,

black, ‘ōiwi, perspectives outside the domain of current scholarship. As seen in this brief introduction of biopolitics the dominant gaze is male, white, and Western. Criticisms of the field of biopolitics have raised questions and concerns along these same lines, recognizing the “neglect of historical and cultural contextualization” or its “monolithic, reductive, and homogenizing claims” as well as its “embrace of a theological lexicon that seems to be mystifying and vague” and rooted in a Judeo-Christian worldview that never makes explicit its conception of humanity “as synonymous with western Man” (Campbell and Sitze 2013, 5; Weheliye 2014, 4). In this way, the historical orientation of biopolitics reflects a history of Christianity in which, “The religion of Jesus starts as a small Jewish sect, then enters the Greek world, then the Roman, then the German, and so on” (Charlot 2010, 29). This is, in my opinion, one reason a convergence between mo‘okū‘auhau and biopolitics is necessary and productive for the theoretical development of both fields of inquiry. Consider, for example, one central aspect of the Kumulipo that is grounded in and reflective of an ‘ōiwi belief system: sex as the generative force of the universe manifested in practices that extend within and between the mundane and sacred domains of human activity, in and across time periods, and traversing the spheres of life and politics. As a procreative composition, the Kumulipo highlights the connections between reproduction in nature and reproduction of man embodied within the development of the universe; it is a genealogy of all things born through developmental processes and regulated within a mo‘okū‘auhau framework to ensure a thriving population. In the 19th century Kingdom, faced with the decline of the population and a shifting/syncretic belief system, mo‘okū‘auhau was one area in which a projected ‘ōiwi future was oriented and potentially realized.

Campbell and Sitze write that there is “no point for observing the totality of biopolitics...there exists no perspective that would allow us to survey and measure the lines that together constitute the concept’s theoretical circumference” (2013, 2). It is exactly this inability that acts as “an invitation to be creative...a solicitation to bring other methodologies, practices, and interpretive keys to bear on the study of biopolitics” (Ibid).

Kalākaua—Building Political Power through the Kumulipo and Beyond

David La‘amea Kamanakapu‘u Mahinulani Naloia‘ehuokalani Lumialani Kalākaua was elected the seventh mō‘ī of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1874. He was the son of the ali‘i Kahanu Kapa‘akea and Anale‘a Keohokalole and “he omaka no loko mai o ka niau koi-ula a Keaweheulu, he koa, he kakaolelo, a he kuhikuhi puuone na Kamehameha I., ka Nai-Aupuni kamahao a kaulana o ka Pakipika [a (a bud as a new plant) descendant of the sacred line of Keaweheulu, a warrior, an orator, and an architect/civil engineer for the remarkable and famous conqueror of the Pacific, Kamehameha I]” (Poepoe 1891, 5).³ As a descendant of a high-ranking family he was raised to be a future leader of the lāhui. His training encompassed a wide range activities, which manifested in his abilities as an intellectual, musician, patron of traditional and modern arts, world traveler, innovator and politician. His reign is marked by the revitalization and public performance of ‘ōiwi traditions that functioned as the basis for the political narrative of the lāhui and which was founded on his mo‘okū‘auhau. Kalākaua’s advocacy and revitalization of cultural traditions worked to promote the strength of the nation, a perspective relegated to the edges of history in the common historical narrative. The acknowledgment of ‘ōiwi tradition as a significant and

³ The Hawaiian terminology used in this passage does not translate easily to English this is a close approximation. All translations in the dissertation are mine unless otherwise indicated.

multifaceted aspect of Kalākaua's leadership is necessary for deciphering the thought processes that resulted in the political motivations and actions of the time. They also function as the basis for analyzing how social, cultural, and political practices were conceptualized within a framework of mo'okū'auhau during this period.

The Kumulipo is arguably the most recognizable expression of cultural tradition brought to life during his reign. It was explicitly deployed to establish Kalākaua's authority but also worked to integrate his mo'okū'auhau within the larger political narrative of the lāhui (Beckwith 1972; Osorio 2002; Silva 2004). As a descendant of Ka'īamamao, for whom the Kumulipo was composed, Kalākaua traced his genealogy to the origins of the universe accumulating the mana that emerged with each birth and solidifying his status as the rightful ruler of the Kingdom. Ongoing genealogical disputes between the Keaweaheulu line and the Kamehameha's came to the fore, at least in public, during the 1874 election process. Historians have asserted that Kalākaua's publication of the cosmogonic genealogy, Kumulipo, was done in order to validate his legitimacy as mō'ī (Osorio 2002; Silva 2004). Opposition to Kalākaua stemmed, in part, from his reputedly inferior genealogy. The 'correct' genealogy was a primary factor in determining, from an 'ōiwi perspective, who could legitimately claim the right to rule. By some, including the prolific 'ōiwi intellectual Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau, Queen Emma was regarded as more closely associated to the Kamehameha's through both her mo'okū'auhau and her marriage to Alexander Liholiho, Kamehameha IV. Support for Queen Emma was based on her familial connection to the Kamehameha dynasty as the descendant of Kamehameha I's younger brother, Keli'imaika'i. She was also perceived

as “staunchly anti-American in her political views and, more, important, antimissionary” (Osorio 2002, 152). These perspectives resonated with a number of ‘ōiwi at the time.

The Kumulipo connected Kalākaua to his ancestor, Ka‘īamamao for whom the Kumulipo was chanted, to Papa and Wākea, and to all the life forms born in pō (darkness/spirit world), and finally to the beginning of time, thus quashing the notion of an inferior lineage. Although the Kumulipo was not published until 1889, two years after he was forced to sign the Bayonet Constitution, he conveyed his authority through cultural performances linked to his lineage combining its symbolic power with other expressions. The visual and spatial demonstrations of his mo‘okū‘auhau associated with the public performance of hula, his coronation regalia and the construction of ‘Iolani Palace for example, were motivated by specific interests that worked in concert with validating his authority. They also asserted ‘ōiwi ideas of leadership and nationhood as built upon the traditions of the past in the turbulent late 19th century.

During this period the Kumulipo signified the richness of the past and the ‘ōiwi ability to synthesize traditions and contemporary innovations within a genealogical framework expressed in public displays, in political discourse, and in national symbols. Moreover, the Kumulipo imparts that leadership is premised on having a genealogical connection to pono and the balance of the universe. In concert with its genealogical structure, the Kumulipo also functions as a pule ho‘ola‘a ali‘i, a prayer that sanctifies the chief. As a pule ho‘ola‘a ali‘i the Kumulipo emphasizes chiefly status and the responsibilities to the lāhui embedded within that position. One area in which Kalākaua exhibited his chiefly kuleana to the lāhui functioned in connection with his slogan, Ho‘oulu lāhui, to increase the nation.

In his campaign for the throne and throughout his rule, Kalākaua maintained the slogan, Ho‘oulu lāhui. Originally, efforts to increase the nation were compelled by the persistent decline of the ‘ōiwi population that began with the arrival of European foreigners in 1778. Increasing the nation became a rallying point among the ali‘i and at its root the push to ho‘oulu lāhui was inherently connected to procreation and proliferating the ‘ōiwi population. Yet, Kalākaua’s platform and rule also promoted the concept of increasing the nation in a variety of other capacities that speak to the kind of lāhui that he envisioned and was compelled to support in line with his genealogical kuleana. Kalākaua’s rule allowed and demanded space for ‘ōiwi ideas and practices to expand and flourish in both public and private spaces. Hula is the most widely recognized practice associated with Kalākaua’s rule but he also encouraged other ‘ōiwi traditions such as lua (martial arts) and lā‘au lāpa‘au (medicine). Beyond the expression of cultural forms, Kalākaua fostered the mindset inherent to these practices. As part of his project to ho‘oulu lāhui, he championed the use of mo‘okū‘auhau, mele and mo‘olelo to determine and express ‘ōiwi history and knowledge and in turn advanced interests in the natural sciences, anthropology, literature, technology, and other belief systems. Unfortunately, as mentioned previously, much of the intellectual exploration that took place during his reign has been clouded by historical accounts drawn from perspectives that focused on the failure of the monarchy rather than on its vitality, of which the intellectual world the mō‘ī supported was so much a part of.

The erosion of the cultural traditions that Kalākaua sought to reinvigorate throughout his reign was due primarily to the spread of Christianity by U.S. missionaries and their descendents who advocated a worldview and religious perspective that was

often antithetical to the life affirming practices of ‘ōiwi, but can be excavated in the foundations of theories of biopower. After decades of suppression due to Christian values and the simultaneous decline of the population caused by introduced diseases, the expression of cultural traditions made possible by the policies and practices encouraged by Kalākaua presented ‘ōiwi “as a strong people with a proud history” (Silva 2004, 89). This worked in direct contrast to the discourse of savagery perpetuated by some missionary descendents and their sympathizers who advocated a stronger political and cultural connection to the U.S.

Race and contests over power were issues that greatly affected the Hawaiian Kingdom from its inception, through the spread of Christianity, the introduction of capitalism, and the influences of imperialism. These tensions came to a head during Kalākaua’s reign and were perpetuated during his sister, Mō‘īwahine Lili‘uokalani’s, short tenure as monarch. Although the issues of race, vying political views, and differing visions of independence affected the social and political contexts of the Kingdom and its governance, historians have tended to frame the shift in power away from ali‘i and ‘ōiwi control as a pre-determined outcome embedded exclusively in racial conflict rather than in competing political and economic interests (Armstrong 1904; Kuykendall 1967; Daws 1968; Fuchs 1984). According to Jonathan Osorio, the discourse perpetuated by the haole elite in the latter part of Kalākaua’s reign framed the Hawaiian situation as such, “Whether the Hawaiians were doomed because of their paganism, their devotion to their chiefs, their want of private property, their laziness, their lack of sanitation, or, finally, their opposition to haole, in the end they were just naturally doomed” (Osorio 2002, 224).

Kalākaua's reign was marred by political instability from start to end. As noted, he was elected amid a contentious rivalry with the dowager queen Emma Naea Kaleleonālani Rooke, widow of Kamehameha IV Alexander Liholiho. Kalākaua was the first mō'ī to face a vocal faction of 'ōiwi opposition due in part to his perceived genealogical inferiority to his rival, Queen Emma. The election proved a contentious time, devolving into a riot after Kalākaua's victory was announced. The riot was led by an 'ōiwi opposition who felt betrayed by the way fellow 'ōiwi legislators had voted in favor of Kalākaua over Queen Emma. The election also resulted in the first trial for treason in the Kingdom's history. Kepelino, a supporter of Queen Emma and an 'ōiwi intellectual and historian, was charged and tried for treason for allegedly writing letters to England and Italy requesting assistance to put the Queen on the Hawaiian throne. His letters accused the mō'ī of potentially destroying the nation's independence by "mortgaging the government to some foreign government for a million dollars" (PCA 1874, 4). However, Tiffany Lani Ing Tsai portrays a different response to his ascension. She writes in reference to Kalākaua's tour of the islands after his election, "While the tour did reveal that a small percentage of maka'āinana outside of Honolulu did not care for their new mō'ī, the aloha throughout Hawai'i showed a widespread acceptance and support of Kalākaua" (Tsai 2014, 136). Moreover, he was celebrated throughout the tour by "people of all ages and races" who came together "to show their aloha for Kalākaua" in a conscious effort to unite the lāhui amid an atmosphere of political uncertainty (Ibid, 137-38).

Kalākaua's 'ōiwi detractors were also opposed to a Treaty of Reciprocity with the United States, a policy he was initially against but came to support prior to the election.

The treaty allowed for Hawaiian grown sugar to be exported and sold in the U.S. duty free. Sentiment amongst his detractors viewed the treaty as potentially allowing for U.S. dominion or encroachment on the Kingdom's territory, mainly through a cession of Pearl Harbor. Additionally, talk of annexation to the U.S. had been circulating within the population since the 1860s and the treaty was viewed as one step closer to that possibility. Yet, despite the opposition Kalākaua faced within certain segments of the lāhui, he was also revered and loved by his people throughout his reign. They viewed him as the people's mō'ī, a king who could be approached and engaged in conversation by the common man, a different type of mō'ī than previously existed (Ibid).

Kalākaua's leadership ended in 1891 upon his death in San Francisco after years of internal political strife and limitations imposed upon his executive authority by missionary descendents and (American) businessmen who sought greater control over the Kingdom government and people. This faction, led by businessmen from the sugar industry, enforced the 1887 so-called Bayonet constitution on the mō'ī, which severely divested the authority of the executive and allowed non-nationals a voice in government decision making. It also made real the concerns of Kalākaua's opposition, giving the U.S. greater control over the Kingdom's territory.

The examples of cultural resurgence, based on Kalākaua's mo'okū'auhau made public during his reign functioned to demonstrate his status and pride in his family and lāhui in the face of these struggles. These displays "demonstrated the unification of the lāhui in a nationalist maka'āinana alliance, which was critical during that time" (Ibid, 137).

“E hoomaopopopia, he lahui kakou me ko kakou Moolelo Kahiko, i ano like loa aku me ka moolelo kahiko o ka lahui o Helene; a he mau mele kahiko hoi ka ko kakou mau kupuna like aku a i oi aku nohoi ko lakou hiwahiwa ame ke kilakila i ko na mele kaulana loa o ua lahui Helene nei” (Ka Nai Aupuni 1906) Joseph M. Peepoe, wrote this passage at a time when the dominant political narratives based in the U.S., portrayed ‘ōiwi as ignorant savages. In this passage Peepoe urges his readers to understand that the lāhui Hawai‘i is a lāhui of mo‘olelo, similar to Greece, and like the Greek histories these mo‘olelo are the basis of ‘ōiwi society. But Peepoe also proclaims that the mo‘olelo kahiko (ancient stories), which include the Kumulipo, are not just as good as, but are in fact better than the cherished and admirable stories of the Greeks, the foundation of Western society. Peepoe is simultaneously asserting the knowledge found in the ‘ōiwi intellectual past and reminding ‘ōiwi both then and now that this past, in fact, existed—in its richness and wealth, its vastness and creativity, its aesthetic, literary and political qualities. In the full text of the article, Peepoe’s description of the ancient mele imbricates the lyricism of the language and the fluidity of thought that are inherent to ‘ōiwi intellectual traditions. His imagery conjures a world where intelligence, education, creativity, and multiplicity are concepts that are not only appreciated but are sources of pride that strengthen the lāhui, despite the socio-political changes that have been endured. I hope to perpetuate this recognition for ‘ōiwi today and the future and to foster a greater comprehension of the ways in which our kūpuna (ancestors) thought by explicating the contributions made during Kalākaua’s reign that exemplify these qualities and conjure the world Peepoe illustrates.

Chapter Introductions

Chapter Two, “Mo‘okū‘auhau: Life and Power in Overlapping Conceptual Landscapes,” considers the 1874 election period and argues that mo‘okū‘auhau is a claim to both authority and the continued life of the lāhui through the figure of the mō‘ī. The guiding questions of the chapter ask: If the life of the lāhui is embodied in the mō‘ī, and more specifically in the mō‘ī’s mo‘okū‘auhau, how is that life conceived? Moreover, how do these conceptions of life based in a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau correlate to political practices and relations to power? The chapter begins with an overview of religious and social change in the early 19th century paying particular attention to the shift from ‘ai kapu (restricted eating) to ‘ai noa (free eating) and the introduction of Christianity while drawing on biopolitics at various points to ascertain conceptions of life during the transformative span leading up to the 1874 election period. Examining ‘ai kapu as a system of governance presents an initial glimpse into conceptualizations of life and life’s relation to power established in, through, and by way of mo‘okū‘auhau. Christianity’s introduction in the islands disrupts and reshapes those views in distinct ways. The chapter then examines the terms pō and ao as an organizational pair in which all forms of life are born within the Kumulipo. These terms also frame important distinctions related to life within missionary discourse. Whereas pō and ao act as a correlative pair in the Kumulipo birthing life in balance, in Christianity pō and ao are the dividing line between sin and salvation, ignorance and enlightenment, heathen and civilized. The Kumulipo presents pō and ao as complementary forces necessary to the development of the universe. Christianity frames them as opposing forces always in conflict. Pō and ao provide a mode in which to disentangle the layers of meaning accumulated in the context

of a changing Hawaiian Kingdom to draw out the broader meanings associated with the genealogical and political assertions of the 1874 election and their bearing on the continued life of the lāhui.

Chapter Three, “Ho‘oulu Lāhui: Sex, Procreation and Production,” works toward a reformulation of humanity embedded in Western universalizing principles that is then applied to an expanded understanding of biopower. The chapter analyzes the ways in which Kalākaua deployed what may be considered an ‘ōiwi version of biopower through relational aspects of mo‘okū‘auhau in order to increase the nation. Biopower describes relations of power “articulated upon the body of the population with the intention of fostering particular attributes” (Campbell 2013, 26). In this chapter I consider sex, procreation and production (cultural and capitalist) to explore biopower in the context of Kalākaua’s political slogan, Ho‘oulu Lāhui, to investigate relations of power and articulations upon the lāhui that encouraged its proliferation. Just as identifying biopower is “not a value-free activity that follows a universal logic of research,” there is no singular or definitive mode in which meaning can be derived from mo‘okū‘auhau (Lemke 2011, 2). Moreover, the overarching goal of this dissertation is to work toward establishing mo‘okū‘auhau as a larger framework in which many applications and methods operate. As an intellectual construction imbricating knowledge, culture, and politics, mo‘okū‘auhau engenders the conceptual structure of Kalākaua’s political slogan, Ho‘oulu Lāhui. Within this framework we find the expressions of Kalākaua’s leadership in ways that intervene with theories of biopower made visible through the deployment of his slogan that places sex, procreation, and production at its foundation in order to support and proliferate life in its many forms.

Chapter Four, “Ho‘oulu Lāhui: ‘Ōiwi Bodies of Knowledge,” extends the arguments put forward in Chapter Three in relation to Kalākaua’s political slogan, Ho‘oulu Lāhui. The chapter applies the slogan to the extensive cultural productions manifested during his reign and in conjunction with his mo‘okū‘auhau, Kumulipo. The chapter focuses on the work of Ka Papa Kū‘auhau o Nā Ali‘i Hawai‘i (Papa Kū‘auhau) referred to in English as the Board of Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs (Board). Increasing the cultural attributes of the lāhui reflects a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau that operates to both extend and proclaim the life of the lāhui and mō‘ī in a manner similar to the argument put forward in Chapter Two. Our conceptions of the past are directly tied to and inclusive of the contributions made by ancestors who lived before us, appended by those living in the present, and built upon by our children in the future. Information flows back and forth in time adding to a system of knowledge, of relationships, and of life. Thus drawing links between Kamehameha I and Kalākaua’s leadership, for example, works to express relations of power constructed and perpetuated within a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau. Moreover, in as much as Kalākaua sought the protection and proliferation of ‘ōiwi bodies, he also encouraged the increase of ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge through the cultural and political institutions that he created and the public performances and displays of his leadership.

Chapter 2

Mo‘okū‘auhau: Life and Power in Overlapping Conceptual Landscapes

William Charles Lunalilo, the sixth mō‘ī of the Hawaiian Kingdom, died of tuberculosis on February 3, 1874 having ruled for just over one year. He was the son of the ali‘i Charles Kana‘ina and Miriam Auhea Kekāuluohi. Through his mother’s lineage, he claimed descent from Kamehameha I’s half brother, Kalaimamahu. As with four of the mō‘ī who ruled before him and the two who ruled after, Lunalilo died without children⁴ of his own to carry on his legacy of chiefly duty and add to his family line. Like his predecessor Kamehameha V Lota Kapuāiwa, the last mō‘ī of the Kamehameha dynasty, he died without naming an heir resulting in the second time in ‘ōiwi history that a mō‘ī would be elected to the position. Lunalilo’s refusal to name an heir required the legislature to select the new mō‘ī from a specific group of candidates who held the greatest and most direct claim to the throne based on their mo‘okū‘auhau.

The death of mō‘ī Lunalilo from a pulmonary illness, childless, and without an heir underlines the critical circumstances facing the lāhui. That the mō‘ī Kamehameha IV and V also died of poor health at relatively early ages and without children⁵ further emphasizes the dire circumstances of the lāhui in terms of well-being and continued independence represented in a strong head of state. In 1874 the newspaper *Ka Nuhou Hawaii* commented, “Aole e make ka Mana Alii; a aole no hoi e hiki ke hukiia i lalo ka hae aupuni. The Sovereign authority must never die, and the royal standard must never be

⁴ Kauikeaouli, KIII had two children who died in infancy. He adopted Alexander Liholiho, Kamehameha IV, and made him his heir. Although Kalākaua didn’t have children of his own, he did have heirs. The purpose is to show that the ali‘i were not reproducing, this problem was reflected in the populace hence Kalākaua’s motto, *Ho‘oulu Lāhui*, which will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.

⁵ Alexander Liholiho, Kamehameha IV had a child who died as a toddler.

hauled down” (KNH 1874).⁶ Lunalilo’s passing placed the enduring sovereign authority, ka Mana Ali‘i, on tremulous ground. Confronted with these conditions, the lāhui needed a new mō‘ī who stood as the reflection and embodiment of a vital and independent Hawaiian Kingdom, he pua mae ‘ole i ka lā, an unwilting flower in the sun.⁷

The tension surrounding the 1874 election period reflected broader concerns associated with the health and independence of the nation. The contention between the two candidates to the throne, dowager Queen Emma and Kalākaua extended beyond political rivalry or chiefly acquisition of power, at stake was the very life of the lāhui, the life of the lāhui imperiled by disease, ideological conflict and colonial intent. This chapter argues that in the context of the period, mo‘okū‘auhau becomes both a claim to sovereign authority and a claim to the continued life of the lāhui through the figure of the mō‘ī. It apprehends the life of the lāhui as embodied in the mō‘ī, in mo‘okū‘auhau, and in the words and actions set forth in the ensuing reign. The chapter takes up the questions: If the life of the lāhui is embodied in the mō‘ī, and more specifically in the mō‘ī’s mo‘okū‘auhau, how is that life conceived? Moreover, how do these conceptions of life based in a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau correlate to political practices and relations to power?

The following sections of the chapter begin with an overview of religious and social change in the early nineteenth century paying particular attention to the shift from ‘ai kapu to ‘ai noa and the introduction of Christianity while drawing on biopolitics at various points to ascertain and interpret conceptions of life during the transformative span

⁶ The English translation comes from the “Second Intereggnum” compilation of newspaper articles from the period, translated during the period.

⁷ The phrase literally translates as, “a flower that does not wilt in the sun” and is a common reference to Kalākaua, the successor to the throne after Lihiliho. This reference to Kalākaua found in a variety of mele. See Chapter Four.

leading up to the 1874 election period. Examining ‘ai kapu as a system of governance presents an initial glimpse into conceptualizations of life and life’s relation to power established in, through, and by way of mo‘okū‘auhau. Christianity’s introduction in the islands disrupts and reshapes those views in distinct ways. The chapter then examines the terms pō and ao as an organizational pair in which all forms of life are born within the Kumulipo. These terms also frame important distinctions related to life within missionary discourse. Whereas pō and ao act as a correlative pair in the Kumulipo birthing life in balance, in Christianity pō and ao are the dividing line between sin and salvation, ignorance and enlightenment, heathen and civilized. The Kumulipo presents pō and ao as complementary forces necessary to the development of the universe. Christianity frames them as opposing forces always in conflict. I contend that pō and ao provide one mode in which to disentangle the layers of meaning accumulated in the context of a changing Hawaiian Kingdom to draw out the broader political and genealogical meanings brought to bear on the continued life of the lāhui.

Historical Overview and Theoretical Positioning

Dowager Queen Emma and Kalākaua developed an intense political rivalry during the struggle over the succession of the next mō‘ī. When Kalākaua was officially elected to the position of mō‘ī on February 12, 1874 a riot broke out in Honolulu soon after the decision was made public underlining the enmity between the two candidates and their supporters. Their contest for the crown during the election period played out in the newspapers, in public discourse, and in private communications.⁸ A key element in this struggle for the election was based on the merits of both candidates’ mo‘okū‘auhau.

⁸ See, for example, Lili‘uokalani 1991; Kanahele 1999; Osorio 2002.

Both candidates' genealogies were debated by recognized historians and genealogists of the time who argued through a specific standard of measure that calculated their proximity to Kamehameha I, the founder of the aupuni, the unified Kingdom government. Public meetings were held to discuss the political and genealogical qualities of each candidate, and Queen Emma and Kalākaua produced and disseminated election materials in an effort to raise the public's support for their candidacies with the hope that widespread public endorsement would urge the legislators to vote according to the will of the people whom they had swayed to their corners.

Both candidates made references to the continued life of the lāhui in their election materials, dispersed in both English and Hawaiian. Queen Emma exclaimed that the prayer of her heart was, "E Ola O Hawaii I Ke Akua!" translated in the English version of her materials as, "God Save Hawaii Nei!" and can also be taken to mean Hawai'i will/should live, continue, survive through God. This has a decidedly European inflection when declared in English as it is reflective of the phrases "God save the Queen" or "God save the King" and this emphasis is carried in her Hawaiian expression as well. Kalākaua's messaging used some of the same terms but with one profound exception. His materials proclaim "E Ola E Hawaii!" translated in the English version of his announcement as, "God Preserve Hawaii" and can also be understood as Hawai'i will/should/must live, survive, continue or thrive. Kalākaua does not explicitly make reference to the continuance of Hawai'i through the mana of ke Akua, as Queen Emma does. Although the preservation and continuance of the lāhui was certainly as important to both candidates the power associated with maintaining that life, and even more simply how that life was constituted, was expressed and perhaps conceived in disparate ways.

Conceptions of life and how it is envisioned, imagined, and brought into being in relation to the lāhui explored through Kalākaua’s mo‘okū‘auhau, the Kumulipo, illuminates the contrasting proclamations of the 1874 election materials. Interpreting these conceptions by way of the Kumulipo, I argue, also makes explicit the intervention of new modes of understanding life and power in the Hawaiian Kingdom during this period. Yet, the framework of mo‘okū‘auhau and all of its related concepts—mana, kapu (sacred, prohibition), kuleana (privilege, responsibility)—is maintained as the primary determinant of authority in 1874, despite decades of Christian influence, Euro-American political machinations, and massive population decline due to introduced diseases. The reliance on ‘ōiwi principles in the face of wide spread encounter and transition speaks to the creativity, flexibility, and nuance of ‘ōiwi traditions. Kamana Beamer asserts a similar argument. He contends, “the Hawaiian Kingdom was a Hawaiian creation. Even prior to contact with foreigners, ‘Ōiwi had developed an ancient kind of statecraft. This was the foundation for the Hawaiian Kingdom. Ali‘i were strategic in their adaptations and were active agents in appropriating laws, protocols, and technologies” (2014, 15). It also speaks to the larger institutions of the Kingdom as a constitutional monarchy, as a modern government, and as a Christian nation. Although sweeping changes to religion and government reflect outwardly the influence and intervention of foreign peoples, ideas, tools, and customs—at their core, they are ‘ōiwi manifestations.

The inherency of mo‘okū‘auhau to ‘ōiwi ideas of leadership extending across epochs of time cannot be overemphasized. It is the primary legitimizing factor in determining the authority of one ali‘i over another. In the 19th century, mo‘okū‘auhau is positioned as the means by which political power and narrative are constructed in

overlapping conceptual landscapes as indicated in the election materials of the two candidates. These landscapes encompass both old and new ways of thinking, knowing, and being in the world. They cross the boundaries between traditional and modern conceptions of power and authority undeniably influenced by Christian doctrine, the demise of the population, and Euro-American value systems all of which were integral aspects of the social fabric at the time. These were landscapes of encounter, collision and colonial intent. I turn again to Beamer and his rendering of the binary of traditional and modern. He notes that Pukui and Elbert's Hawaiian Dictionary has no equivalent translation for the word traditional. Instead, the descriptive phrase "mai nā kūpuna mai" is given, which can be interpreted as what comes from the ancestors into this modern time (1986, 549). Beamer reads this as meaning "as generations pass, more knowledge can be passed down from the ancestors to the succeeding generations. The process is open-ended and collective; it is intergenerational and always expanding" (Beamer 2014, 15). This interpretation operates within a framework of mo'okū'auhau in that our conceptions of the past are directly tied to and inclusive of the contributions made by ancestors who lived before us, appended by those living in the present, and built upon by our children in the future. Information flows back and forth in time adding to a system of knowledge, of relationships, and of life.

There are a number of overlapping conceptual landscapes that this chapter engages to illuminate mo'okū'auhau as a claim to both sovereign authority and the continued life of the lāhui beginning with an interrogation of what constitutes life and its relation to power and politics. Ultimately, the manner in which life is imagined and interconnected in mo'okū'auhau, I contend, emphasizes the ontological conditions

wherein relations of power and politics are realized. Agamben asserts in *Homo Sacer* that “Western politics is a bio-politics from the very beginning” (1998, 102). Likewise, I consider ‘ōiwi politics as a biopolitics from the very beginning though imagined differently than Agamben’s version through European sovereign power and subjected bare life “enacted over the tortured, disemboweled, charred, and hacked bodies of humans” (Povinelli 2016, 1). Elizabeth Povinelli holds that “Royal power was not merely a claim of an absolute power over life. It was a carnival of death. The crowds gathered in a boisterous jamboree of killing...not in reverent silence around the sanctity of life” (Ibid, 2). ‘Ōiwi politics in the 19th century engaged royal power through mo‘okū‘auhau even as that sovereign authority reflected European modes of rule in some aspects. The difference between these enactments of power perceived through mo‘okū‘auhau illustrates the ‘ōiwi view of the intersection of life and politics within both its form and function, regulating biological processes (sex, birth, relationships) to maintain political order and sustain a thriving population through “the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life” (Foucault 1990, 140).

Moreover, Western biopolitics from Agamben to Esposito and beyond, formulates a distinction between biological life, life that simply reproduces, animal life and political life, way of life, well lived life based on the Greek terms, *zoē* and *bios*, enframing Western politics in relation to the management of populations and the biological processes that sustain or restrict their proliferation. Whereas formulations of life in cosmogonic genealogies like the Kumulipo render a distinction between *zoē* and *bios* less clear. In mo‘okū‘auhau I interpret all forms of life as both reproducing and living politically thereby critiquing a conception of biopower entrenched in the separation of

bodies and things that occupy those distinctions in Western politics. By virtue of being included in the cosmic unfolding presented in the Kumulipo for example, the smallest observable life form, the uku ko‘ako‘a (coral polyp) is given political life. It lives politically while reproducing to establish the reef ecosystem, sustaining the environment necessary for the survival and flourishing of other organisms. In this view, the authority Kalākaua draws upon through his mo‘okū‘auhau is not weighted solely by his human or anthropomorphic godly relatives, though it is humans that biopolitical scholarship typically references in making a distinction between zoē and bios. In fact much of the biopolitical struggle in defining and understanding life in relation to power and politics appears to rest on the distinction between animal life and human life (or man), and the “conception found in Western traditions according to which the human being is the crown of evolution” rather than part of its continuum (Lemm 2009, 3). In contrast to these conceptions of power and biopolitics, I argue that Kalākaua’s mana and authority received through his mo‘okū‘auhau proceeds from the natural (animal) environment born before his human and godly ancestors beginning with the uku ko‘ako‘a, promoting the notions that all life is political and all life is born. In this chapter, I contend that the notion of sovereign authority based on a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau—an ‘ōiwi form of biopower in my estimation—is wrapped around these conceptions of the interrelation of life and political power so vastly different in its expression from the sovereign power found in Western examples.

Mo‘okū‘auhau as a claim to authority and the continued life of the lāhui in 19th century Hawai‘i is further emboldened by the convergence of ‘ōiwi concepts and biopolitics with Christianity. Again, to follow Agamben’s line of thinking, in as much as

Western politics is always a biopolitics it is also always embedded in Christian theology, which functions as an originary site of excavation for understanding modern biopower or the West's "emergence from a classical and especially Christian theme of pastoral power" (Lemm 2009, 153). Similarly, understanding Christianity's impact on the evolution of 'ōiwi society is integral to unpacking the conceptual transformations in relation to life incurred through its introduction. If life is conceived in particular ways embedded in mo'okū'auhau which forms expressions of power and political practice, what changes occur with the introduction of Christianity and how are those changes understood in relation to power and constructions of sovereignty?

Changing Traditions

Ho'okauhua Papa I Ka Moku

The first company of American missionaries arrived in Kailua, Hawai'i in 1820 after a long voyage from New England. The company was made up of Calvinist husbands and wives intent upon saving heathen souls and spreading the word of the one true God within a polytheistic society. They arrived amid significant transformation in 'ōiwi religious and political practice—the abolishment of the 'ai kapu and transition to 'ai noa, which had lasting effects on the political structure and religious practices of the people.

'Ai kapu was a religiously based system of governance and "the central metaphor of separation around which traditional Hawaiian society was organized" (Kame'eleihiwa 1992, 33). The system was established in the cosmogonic mo'okū'auhau of Papahānaumoku and Wākea, which originates in the Kumulipo but also functions as an

independent mo‘olelo (Oliveira 2014, 5). Papa is personified as earth mother, as indicated in her name, Papa who births islands. She is also the embodiment of “the ‘āina even as she is able to create more ‘āina” (McDougall 2016, 87). Wākea is the embodiment of the expansive sky and the father from whom multiple generations are established. Papa and Wākea’s mo‘okū‘auhau and associated mo‘olelo reflect conceptions of life, the interrelation between beings, and manifestations of political power expressed similarly in the Kumulipo. However, it is also important to note that theirs is just one mo‘okū‘auhau in which political and religious traditions are manifested and this section narrowly assesses just a few of those components. Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa has advanced the tradition of Papa and Wākea in establishing “fundamental patterns for Ali‘i Nui behavior” and identified “three traditional metaphors from which all of Hawaiian society flows”; ‘ai kapu, nī‘aupi‘o, and mālama ‘āina. (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 23-5). Her work has been foundational to a deeper understanding of mo‘okū‘auhau through her analysis and explication of these metaphors but again, hers is just one interpretation of the mo‘olelo gleaned from the ‘ōiwi historians David Malo and Samuel Kamakau who were writing under the direction of the missionary educator Sheldon Dibble. This section of the chapter highlights aspects of her analysis that coincide with my larger arguments connecting life and power through a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau that will be built further as the chapter progresses.

There are myriad ways to interpret mo‘okū‘auhau and the lessons regarding life and politics that can be extricated from them. The following section looks specifically at life birthed through male and female sources that connect human life with the spiritual and natural environments and ultimately extend what is considered “living” to include

animate—humans, animals—and inanimate objects—rocks, rain, wind, water—as part of our genealogies. However, mo‘okū‘auhau as an all encompassing framework is also inclusive of family relations that extend beyond heteronormative or purely biological formations. Some of these relationships such as punalua (having more than one lover) and po‘olua (a child of two fathers) will be taken up in later sections but there are others as well such as the tradition of hānai, to be raised or fostered within a family that may or may not have biological ties with one’s birth family, that will not be addressed but are important to name because they make evident the breadth of mo‘okū‘auhau in ‘ōiwi conceptions.

David Malo asserts the importance of this progenitor pair to ‘ōiwi genealogies, “O keia poe wale no kai olelo ia mai ma ko Hawaii nei mau mookuahau Kupuna, nolaila, o lakou nei no ke kumu mua o ko Hawaii lahui a pau [These were the people who are mentioned in Hawai‘i(’s) ancestral genealogies, therefore, they are the ancestors of all the Hawaiian people” (Malo 1996, 4 and 142). Abraham Fornander further explains their significance,

Ma ka moolelo o Wakea, ua olelo nui ia, oia na kupuna mua o keia mau aina, a ma o laua la i laha mai ai na kanaka, a o laua na kupuna alii o keia noho ana. Ua oleloia ma ko Wakea mookuahau laua a me kana wahine o Papa, ua hanau mai keia mau moku mai loko mai o laua.

In the tradition of Wakea it has been generally stated that they were the first parents of these lands, and that it was by them that the people were propagated, and that they were the ancestors of the chiefs of these islands. It is told in the history of Wakea and his wife Papa that these islands were born from them. (Fornander 1999, 12-13)

In addition to islands, Papa and Wākea birthed a daughter, Ho‘ohōkūkalani who figures prominently in the establishment of the system of ‘ai kapu. According to one

interpretation of the mo‘olelo⁹, Wākea began to desire his daughter who had grown in beauty as she aged and he hoped “to gratify his desire without his sister and wahine (woman, or wife) knowing of it” (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 23). His kahuna (advisor) devised a religio-political solution in the practice of ‘ai kapu, which required the separation of males and females when eating, during menstruation, and during the four nights of the lunar month “set aside for special worship of the four major male Akua, Kū, Lono, Kāne, and Kanaloa” (Ibid). It was through these required separations, that regulated and managed the biological, political, and religious processes of the population, that Wākea was able, for a time, to meet clandestinely with Ho‘ohōkūkalani and satisfy his desire.

The nī‘aupi‘o (chiefly incest)¹⁰ relationship between father and daughter produced two sons. Their first son Hāloanakalaukapalili (long stalk/breath quivering in the wind) was born ‘alu‘alu (misshapen, premature) and buried on the east side of their house. From the location of his burial the first kalo grew, becoming both the elder sibling and staple food for the following generations. Ho‘ohōkūkalani and Wākea also bore a younger son whom they named Hāloa in honor of his older brother. According to mo‘olelo, Hāloa became the first ali‘i or the first man. Kepelino explains “E hoomaopopo iho oukou, o na keiki i hanau ia mai ka puhaka o Haloa, o oukou no ia...I Lauoa ka ai, i loa ka Moo o na kupuna, o na Aumakua no ia o ka po e olelo ia nei [Now you must understand that the children born from Haloa, these are yourselves...Lauoa is

⁹ There are many mo‘olelo about Papa, Wākea, and Ho‘ohōkūkalani and likewise a number of interpretations.

¹⁰ Chiefly incest is one translation for the practice of nī‘aupi‘o however incest in English denotes an illegal or illicit sexual relationship between family members that does not exist in an ‘ōiwi understanding of nī‘aupi‘o. Pūku‘i and Elbert translate nī‘aupi‘o as “offspring of the marriage of a high-born brother and sister, or half-brother and half-sister. *Lit.*, bent coconut-leaf midrib” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 265).

the food from which grew the succession of the ancestors, the so-called Aumakua-of-the-night” (Beckwith 2007, 192-3).

Asserted in this mo‘olelo is the human genealogical connection to the natural environment, the islands, and kalo as descendants of Papahānaumoku and Wākea. I contend that in mo‘okū‘auhau value is placed on all life through the recognition of life’s interconnection. The equal assessment of life forms within mo‘okū‘auhau is exemplified in the relationship between Hāloanakalaukapalili and Hāloa referred to in Kame‘eleihiwa’s work as the practice of mālama ‘āina (caring for the land). This lesson instructs humans to care for the natural environment as one cares for family. Taken further, mālama ‘āina elucidates the relations to power and management of the population conceptualized in ‘ōiwi tradition and expressed in mo‘okū‘auhau. Plant life is born to nourish humans by becoming food through the figure of Hāloanakalaukapalili. Humans are represented in Hāloa and are responsible for properly managing the vital resource(s). This reciprocal relationship between humans and the natural environment is a common theme in ‘ōiwi traditions and enjoins a human kuleana to the life forms that sustain it. In this view, human life does not “constitute an autonomous island within life” since “any form of life that is cut off from other forms of life declines because it is separated from that which generates its life” (Lemm 2009, 3).

Although in Kame‘eleihiwa’s interpretation mālama ‘āina is formulated as a lesson, I assert that it also functions as an integral rule, a guiding principle, in ‘ai kapu, a system of governance that is religiously based, and indicates one reckoning of life’s relation to power. Thought about in this way, all life (human, plant, animal, natural) is encompassed in law, albeit orally represented in ‘ōiwi tradition, to ensure production and

a thriving population. Here, biological existence is reflected in political existence. Cary Wolfe reads a similar evaluation in Esposito's work that he refers to as "a sort of neovitalism that ends up radically dedifferentiating the field of the living into a molecular wash of singularities that all equally manifest life" (Wolfe 2013, 59). Wolfe is wary of this assessment and relates it to the deep ecology movement of the 1970s and 1980s in North America that espoused what he perceives as a radical biocentrism (Ibid). What differentiates Wolfe's concern with Esposito's promotion of life through an equal valuing of its various forms from the lesson (law) of mālama 'āina is the genealogical connection that exhorts a shared kuleana between species. I argue that all life is valued in mo'okū'auhau because it is understood both as family and in relation to its purpose for sustaining the whole. Furthermore, the genealogical relationship and associated kuleana is incorporated as norms within society and the laws produced therein. Wolfe is ultimately advocating for something very similar in his arguments toward a posthumanist assessment of the ethical treatment of animals. He urges, "the biopolitical point is a newly expanded community of the living...because we are all, after all, potentially animals before the law" (Ibid, 105). The basis for Wolfe's struggle in my estimation is its embeddedness in Western political, juridical, and philosophical norms that has for centuries endeavored to mark the distinction between human and animal rather than recognizing its interconnection. Vanessa Lemm in analyzing Nietzsche's philosophy on animality approaches a similar perspective especially in terms of a shared responsibility between species that moves outside of relationships of domination. Though she argues her point in reference to human to human relationships they are equally applicable to one between humans and the natural environment. She holds, "when humankind engages

with its animality, it gives rise to forms of political life rooted in the sovereign individual's instinct of responsibility" (Lemm 2009, 5). That instinct toward responsibility as a valuing of life "offers the animality of human beings a positive, creative role in the constitution of social and political forms of life" (Ibid). Mo'okū'auhau embraces rather than separates the connection between human and animal explicated in the mo'olelo of Papa and Wākea.

‘Ai kapu at its most basic level was a system that revolved around food and required the separation of the sexes when eating and the restriction of certain foods to both women and men. The foods restricted for women represented the kino lau (bodily forms) of the male akua, the source of mana for male ali'i. The conditions set forth in 'ai kapu held religious and political purposes. Along with limiting foods dedicated to the male akua, women were forbidden from entering the heiau (places of worship), where men conducted ceremonies to the male akua. Ceremonies convened at the heiau served many purposes, some directly related to the maintenance of political power through observation and offerings made to the akua. Kame'eleihiwa indicates for "women to eat these foods would not only allow their mana to defile the sacrifice to the male Akua, but would also encourage them to devour male sexual prowess" embodied in the phallic kino lau (Kame'eleihiwa 1993, 34). Women were strong and powerful with their own sources of mana. Kame'eleihiwa contends, women "give birth to the 'Āina, Akua, and Ali'i, give wisdom to men, revive men from the dead, and destroy men when angry" (Ibid). Moreover, the very gods men worshipped at the heiau were birthed by women indicating the strength of female mana within an 'ōiwi worldview.

Sex and birth were fundamental aspects of the ‘ai kapu and functioned to maintain the system of leadership, worship of the akua, productivity of the ‘āina, and health of the people, practices derived from a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau intended to “produce and regulate customs, habits, and productive practices” (Hardt and Negri 2000,--). Framed in mo‘okū‘auhau, sex is the point of access “to the life of the body and the life of the species” (Foucault 1990, 145).

The goal of ‘ōiwi society under the ‘ai kapu was to achieve pono (balance). Ultimately, pono is attained through the ‘ai kapu by separating mana within a highly stratified ‘ōiwi society based on mo‘okū‘auhau—a separation between kāne and wahine, ali‘i and maka‘āinana (commoners), akua and kānaka (humans). Similar to the correlative pairs that construct and arrange information within cosmogonic genealogies introduced in Chapter 1—kane/wahine, pō/ao, uka/kai, lani/honua—society was likewise divided to organize mana to achieve pono. Society then reflected the construction of the universe through mo‘okū‘auhau, organized in dualistic pairs creating balance in the world. In other words, rather than divided opposing pairs, they were conceived as correlative and complementary, equally imperative to the balance and structure of society and the universe.

In addition to providing an origin story regarding the birth of the islands and its people, the mo‘okū‘auhau of Papa and Wākea can also be understood as establishing or founding new political power. Kekuēwa Kikiloi writes, “Their story documents an important period and shift in Hawaiian history when the sovereignty, as well as control over the islands, is lost by the descendants of the oppressive senior line of the Kumu-honua genealogy” (2010, 81). Ali‘i persisted in their positions on one hand because of

the mana imparted to them through mo‘okū‘auhau, but also because of their service to and aloha for their people as responsibilities embedded in mo‘okū‘auhau. Kikiloi underlines this point, “Chiefs did rise in power and authority, but ritual processes that were put into place required them to continually relate to the maka‘āinana as their representatives on the basis of a shared genealogy and ancestry” (Kikiloi 2012, 13-4). The following proverb further demonstrates this relationship, “I ali‘i no [nō] ke ali‘i i ke kānaka. A chief is a chief because of the people who serve him. This was a reminder to the ali‘i to be considerate toward his people” (Pukui 1983, 125). Likewise, the maka‘āinana upheld their kuleana to the ali‘i by maintaining, as one example, the productivity of the ‘āina. The concept of mālama ‘āina as a duty of the maka‘āinana (as well as ali‘i) was also premised on the mo‘okū‘auhau shared between humans and their environment. Despite the hierarchical class system, ali‘i and maka‘āinana were genealogically related and that connection influenced the behaviors between them and the manner in which society was governed, including how natural resources were maintained. With the shift in power away from the oppressive senior line, Papa and Wākea represent the parents of the new dynasty wherein they rebirth the islands by giving them new names and establishing a new political and social order (Kikiloi 2010, 81). The new social order effectively managed and regulated the population through the principles set forth in their mo‘okū‘auhau organizing ‘ōiwi society around the system of ‘ai kapu, managing resources through mālama ‘āina, and maintaining chiefly mana through nī‘aupi‘o. Their rise to prominence is recorded in the many mele and oli dedicated to their mo‘olelo and “underscores the deep genealogical connections Kānaka have to our islands as well as to the Kānaka of each island” (McDougall 2016, 89). As

such it was a popular mo‘olelo during the reign of Kamehameha I and remains so today because it articulates “a shared and common history between islands, as well as a common ancestry” (Ibid).

‘Ai kapu remained “in effect, especially among the ali‘i ‘ai moku, the ruling chiefs, until the death of Kamehameha” (Silva 2004, 28). It was the highest-ranking ali‘i wahine who promoted the transition to ‘ainoa soon after his death. Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani were two of Kamehameha’s wives and mother to Liholiho, Kamehameha II, heir to his father’s unified aupuni.¹¹ Keopuolani was the “only remaining high tabu chiefess” and according to Kamakau she “gave up the tabu with the consent of all the chiefs”; the ‘ai kapu was toppled through her action of eating coconuts restricted to women and taking other foods with men (Kamakau 1992, 224).

Liholiho was an active participant in the transition to ‘ainoa, but his participation was not without thought or struggle. Liholiho as the new mō‘ī was tasked with balancing political desires from various forefronts. On one side, his cousin Kekuaokalani who was bestowed the akua Kūkā‘ilimoku upon the death of Kamehameha I, was charged with maintaining the religious responsibilities of the kingdom. He was bound to the ‘ai kapu as it was the source of his power and the belief system under which society had been governed for hundreds of years. Kamehameha I was also the inheritor of Kūkā‘ilimoku passed to him when his uncle the ali‘i nui Kalani‘ōpu‘u died. Through his inheritance Kamehameha I was successful in conquering and uniting the four kingdoms of Hawai‘i, Maui, O‘ahu, and Kaua‘i under his rule by maintaining his piety to the akua. Kekuaokalani held the same kuleana to the akua and to the balance of power it

¹¹ Keopuolani is his birth mother and Ka‘ahumanu his ‘foster‘ mother.

symbolized. His duty dictated that if Liholiho failed to uphold his responsibilities to the people, Kekuaokalani through the akua Kūkā‘ilimoku should usurp his authority—just as Kamehameha I did before him.

Further, Kekuaokalani and Liholiho were aware that Ka‘ahumanu and her ali‘i supporters were intent on maintaining a permanent state of ‘ai noa beyond the standard period of mourning in which the regular practice of ‘ai kapu was suspended. Liholiho resisted the invitations to eat with the women in his family at the behest of Kekuaokalani (Arista 2010c, 166). After spending months contemplating whether or not to accede to the pressures placed upon him by Ka‘ahumanu and Keopuolani, he succumbed and “sat down to eat with his female Ali‘i at a lū‘au in Kailua” a gesture to their shared mo‘okū‘auhau—to the women who birthed and raised him—and the kuleana embedded within that relationship (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 78).

The removal of the ‘ai kapu led to the tearing down of heiau and the burning of ki‘i (godly images). However, this was not just a religious overturning; the shift from ‘ai kapu to ‘ai noa had political impacts as well. Liholiho’s advisors accomplished the elimination of potential political rivals to Liholiho’s authority through the abolishment of the traditional system of governance by removing the ceremonial paths to power through the worship of the akua. Arista writes, “...the other ruling chiefs had removed...[the] political path towards usurpation available to any rivals of Liholiho. They leveled the battle field, removing obstructions, in effect all comers could be seen approaching for miles, without the malu [shade, protection] of the akua to protect them” (Arista 2010c, 166). Arista refers here to a metaphorical battlefield but it was a lived one as well.

Kekuaokalani was furious with the decision made by Liholiho to overturn the ‘aikapu and made it known that violence would ensue. The battle of Kuamo‘o took place in the Kona district of Hawai‘i island. It was fought between Kekuaokalani and his small band of warriors against Liholiho’s more formidable forces led by Kalanimoku and Keōpūlani. Kekuaokalani was shot in the leg but continued the fight until “a fatal musket shot to the head” ended his life (Beamer 2014, 82). His brave wife Manono fought with him until “she fell at her husband’s side under a volley of shots” (Kamakau 1992, 228). To this end Kalanimoku was victorious and the ali‘i nui were able to construct new rules of governance, order, and relationships but “choosing the right path to pono would prove the most difficult decision” (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 79).

The shift from ‘ai kapu to ‘ai noa upended the religious and political system of governance that had existed for hundreds of years and reshaped ‘ōiwi society. Although these attributes were transformed, the foundational values embedded in mo‘okū‘ahau that constructed ali‘i relationships to one another, to the lāhui, and to the ‘āina, were maintained even if transfigured. Entering into this unstable environment arrive the first company of New England missionaries.

Hohola Ka Mana, Hohola

Missionaries were an undeniable force of change in the Hawaiian Kingdom but they were not the first foreigners to impact the islands. After Captain Cook’s explorations brought him to Hawai‘i other foreigners began to arrive, transforming various aspects of the social, political, and cultural landscapes of ‘ōiwi society. The increase in trade under Kamehameha I’s rule brought merchants, sailors, and traders from the United States and Great Britain to Hawaiian shores. Foreigners stopped in Hawai‘i to

renew provisions, rest and recover between journeys. During this time, ‘ōiwi were also taking part in new adventures in the fur and whaling industries, departing on ships sailing to the Pacific Northwest, Asia, and beyond. In addition to new ideas, tools, and weapons brought by foreigners, they also introduced diseases that for generations altered the lives of ‘ōiwi.

The epidemics that swept through the population decimated the lāhui. Early population estimates range from 400,000 to 800,000 at the time of Cook’s arrival. In 1893, the year of the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, population numbers had declined to approximately 40,000 (Stannard 1989, 74). A shifting religious and political landscape and a population riven by disease is the context into which the first missionaries enter the Hawaiian Kingdom.

Niklaus Schweizer writes that these early Calvinist missionaries were not “wizened old folks as some might imagine, but young, energetic men filled with an idealism bordering on zeal” (2005, 81). The young Calvinists missionaries sent to Hawai‘i “wished to save the souls of heathens” and were inspired by the “Second Great Awakening” swept up in the religious revival making its way across the northeastern United States in the early 1800s (Ibid, 81). Reverend Hiram Bingham of Bennington, Vermont was in the first company sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). His opening statement, written in *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands*, frames his perspective of place and people. He writes, “Darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people. This, for ages, was emphatically applicable to the isles of the great Pacific Ocean. But the voice divine said, Let there be light” (Bingham 1855, 17). The use of darkness and light metaphorically

applied to the heathen ‘ōiwi and the civilized Christian represents one site of overlapping conceptual landscapes that will be taken up further in the following sections. More broadly it underlines the boundary made explicit in missionary perspectives between the drawbacks of heathenism and the attributes of civilization — “The heathen system, therefore, tends to immeasurable evil; but the Christian system to immeasurable good” (Bingham 1855, 21). Heathen evil for the missionary was found in the worship of many gods, in wanton sexual behavior, drunkenness, and in general ignorance of the almighty God and His word. Bingham observed ‘ōiwi as “Destitute of high moral principle as idolaters of reprobate mind usually are, and by no means distinguished for forming in their own minds, or conveying to others by language, just conceptions of facts...” (Ibid, 18). It was missionaries, like Bingham, who were needed to “bear the lamp of eternal truth in this darkness” (Stewart 1828, 33).

Although the system of ‘ai kapu was abolished prior to missionary arrival, the members in the first companies sent by the ABCFM were intent on further transforming ‘ōiwi into “new creatures” (Ibid). They firmly believed that the “highest type of civilization could not be attained except in conjunction with the Christian religion” (Kuykendall 1968, 101). Civilization thus meant a life well lived through enlightenment and industriousness, nourished by the word of God, literacy, and Christian morality. The newly formed creatures, missionaries hoped, would move away from their old traditions and grow “to see the path to heaven” and recognize the “word of God is a lamp and a light” (Stewart 1828, 98).

Much has been written about the introduction of Christianity to Hawaiian shores, most of it polarizing, portraying ‘ōiwi in much the same way as Bingham and other

missionary accounts. These accounts framed the perspectives of later writers as seen in William N. Armstrong's portrayal of Kalākaua written in the early 1900's that in turn formed the dominant narrative associated with the mō'ī and 'ōiwi in general. Writing during this time is decidedly positive in regard to the contributions made by missionaries and the spread of Christianity in the islands. Armstrong, a one-time friend, confidant, and member of the mō'ī's administration, toured the world with Kalākaua in 1881 and published a memoir of the trip in 1904. It was on this world tour that Kalākaua was able to investigate some of his many intellectual and cultural interests that influenced his legislative initiatives that later chapters will examine—origin stories in Japanese Shinto beliefs, electricity in Paris, military strategy in Italy—while also cultivating international political relationships. Yet despite these pursuits, the last section of the book is dedicated to Armstrong's rendition of the inevitable end of the monarchy. His version of events begins with an explanation of missionary arrival to the islands from the United States in 1820 and an assessment of the many contributions they made to Hawai'i. Armstrong credits the missionaries with civilizing the heathens by establishing schools, reducing the savage language to writing, and establishing wholesome laws (Armstrong 1904, 286). Once this early missionary work was completed Armstrong describes the missionary descendants as the business, professional, and educated members of Hawaiian society. He then goes on to characterize the political controversies of 1887 through 1898 as racial tensions between 'whites' (in particular, missionaries and their descendants) and Polynesians. Armstrong suggests that the reason the monarchy lasted so long was because the 'whites' tolerated its existence despite its "grotesque Polynesian ear-marks" (Ibid, 287). He paints a picture of the mō'ī in 1887, the year the imposed illegal

constitution commonly referred to as the Bayonet Constitution, was enforced through violence, as unruly, weak, and unwilling to abide by the laws set forth by the legislature. His actions are described as those akin to those of a spoiled child. And when the stronger ‘Teutonic’ parents had had enough, “they arose promptly and confronted the King with the bayonet. He instantly yielded to their demands...” (Ibid) The mō‘ī’s “Polynesian earmarks,” funded both publically and privately, and his “utter suppression and strangulation of anything even remotely approaching the ideals of parliamentary or responsible government” were used as excuses to justify the actions of his opponents and as evidence of his continued heathenism and inability to govern the nation leading to its inevitable downfall (HHA 1917, 21). Missionaries and their descendants are rendered the saviors and adults while Kalākaua and by extension, the lāhui, are the childlike savages in need of correcting and saving.

Although this became the prominent depiction over time, when missionaries first arrived ‘ōiwi were well aware of the consequences of Christian intrusion in other parts of the world. In his tour of Hawai‘i island in 1823 Reverend William Ellis encountered ‘ōiwi who were apprised of the experiences of other native peoples in contact with missionaries and foreigners. He writes that ‘ōiwi “had heard that in several countries where foreigners had intermingled with the original natives, the latter had soon disappeared; and should the missionaries come to live at Waiakea, perhaps the land would ultimately become theirs, and kanakas maore [sic] (aborigines) cease to be its occupiers” (Ellis 2004, 312).

Remarkably, it was through the encouragement of ‘ōiwi men—mainly “Henry” ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia—who had departed the islands on trading vessels to explore and travel the

world, eventually settling in New England and attending seminary school from whom the inspiration to send a company of missionaries to Hawai‘i derived. David Chang holds that the “encouragement of missionaries was part of a Kanaka exploration of the world that sprang from deeply indigenous sources” (Chang 2016, 82). ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia intended to voyage with the first missionaries but became ill and passed away before the company departed New England. Four other ‘ōiwi men made the journey in his stead, George Humehume Kaumuali‘i, son of the ali‘i nui Kaumuali‘i of Kaua‘i, William Kanui, John Honoli‘i, and Thomas Hopu. Although he was unable to return to his homeland, ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s contributions to the spread of Christianity within Hawai‘i are significant and reflective of his training as a “learned kahuna who continued to seek more strengthening learning overseas” (Ibid, 88). He translated the Old Testament from Hebrew to Hawaiian and he was fundamental to the development of a grammatical system integral to the advent of literacy in Hawai‘i (Beamer 2014, 85).

Teaching the skills of literacy was one of the requirements instituted by Liholiho upon granting the missionaries’ request to stay in the islands in 1820. The first company of missionaries also brought a printing press, which elevated the importance of literacy further and provided an avenue for the wide dissemination of this new technology.

In 1825 Kauikeaouli, Kamehameha III, claimed his kingdom a nation of literacy for all people, ali‘i and maka‘āinana, in his saying “‘o ko‘u aupuni, he aupuni palapala ko‘u.” Nogelmeier argues that in “taking an active role in the spread of literacy, the king and chiefs were executing their traditional roles as the central authorities of knowledge, a move that would eventually shift authority beyond their control” (2010, 71). Through encouraging reading and writing for all ‘ōiwi the ali‘i made accessible knowledge that

would have previously been held within the confines of the ali‘i and kahuna classes, essentially democratizing knowledge.

Literacy was also an important factor in the widespread conversion to Christianity that eventually took place amongst the ‘ōiwi population. The early conversions may have been spurred by a “mixture of motivations that included allegiance to their Ali‘i Nui, the prospect of the attainment of the valuable tool of literacy, and the recognition that perhaps this new religion held the answer to the devastating problem at the fore of everyone’s minds - the diseases that were ravaging the Native population (Williams 2013, 25).

The ‘ōiwi population declined steadily beginning with the arrival of Captain Cook through the 19th century. Cholera, tuberculosis, measles, small pox, bubonic plague, leprosy, and venereal diseases were but some of the epidemics to hit the kingdom’s shores. The missionary Charles Stewart who came in the second company sent by the ABCFM recorded the following observation in his journals, “but we have become so familiar with the sights of misery, which we cannot even attempt to alleviate, that we are often compelled to turn from them with a sigh, and banish them as quickly as possible from our recollection. We dwell in a land of disease and death...” (1828, 66).

Undoubtedly, some of the diseases suffered by ‘ōiwi were contracted and spread through sex. ‘Ōiwi regarded sexual intercourse in multifaceted contexts, “from union in deep love, to intercourse specifically for procreation, to the sheer excitement of physical attraction, tension and release” (Pukui et al 1972, 83). For prudish New England missionaries these views contrasted significantly with their own. ‘Ōiwi cultural practices related to sex began to transform during this period of encounter with missionaries,

sailors, and venereal disease in part due to Christianity as well as the declining health of the lāhui. The rampant spread of disease amongst the ‘ōiwi population led to moral reforms instituted by the ali‘i to curb prostitution and sex outside of marriage. Foucault holds that “sexuality exists at the point where body and population meet” (Foucault 2003). The undisciplined sexual bodies of ‘ōiwi men and women “sanctioned by all the individual diseases that the sexual debauchee” brings upon oneself act as the precise reason regulatory and disciplinary power expressed by the ali‘i through the moral codes of the missionaries emerge (Ibid). Biographer and religion scholar Marie Alohalani Brown indicates that for decades, ‘ōiwi women “had been sleeping with foreigners for novelties such as Western-style clothing, mirrors, knives, or articles made of iron” (Brown 2016, 64). The islands developed a reputation as the brothel of the Pacific due to these engagements (Ibid). Sailors and ship captains who blamed missionary influence for the reforms met the new restrictions with vocal and violent opposition. However, limiting sexual behavior in accordance with Christian morality became one of the measures most strongly advocated. Historian Kealani Cook argues that from the missionary perspective, “Any sex outside of heterosexual, monogamous marriage reeked of hewa [wrongdoing, opposite of pono], and was a sure ticket back to the ranks of the damned” (Cook 2011, 53). For the recently saved and those seeking the promise of everlasting life through Christian conversion maintaining the moral codes of the missionaries as well as the rules set forth by the ali‘i was inducement for a new outlook on sexual practices.

Kame‘eleihiwa has argued extensively the ABCFM’s influence on the transformation of pono, the shift in land tenure practices, and capitalist motivations. She has also argued that the mission’s promise of ola hou, new or everlasting life, figured

prominently in the conversion to Christianity. She contends, “To a nation whose numbers were dwindling at such an alarming rate, Ola Hou was an inviting promise” (1992, 142). Following a similar line of historical research Osorio claims, “The church became an institution promising life when death was everywhere, and the eventual conversion of Hawaiians by the thousands must be understood in the context of a time when their own religion, akua, and Ali‘i could not prevent them from dying” (2002, 12). Widespread death provided an ideal entrance point for the conversion of souls and the transformation of concepts whereby the meanings of words were maintained but the values associated with them changed dramatically (Cook 2011, 39). In ola hou the meanings of life and death as defined in ‘ōiwi and Christian conceptions converge. How is the promise of new life grasped within these overlapping conceptual landscapes, particularly when they diverge so thoroughly? What is the promise of new life? Is this the same life, the same ola that Queen Emma and Kalākaua refer to in their bids for the position of mō‘ī? One site of interrogation that draws out these shifting values is in the categorical pairing of pō and ao. These notions are further strengthened when unpacked in conversation with biopolitics to underline life as the core and object of ‘ōiwi politics intent on perpetuating a thriving lāhui.

Pō and Ao In Transformation (and Collision)

Pō and ao form one of the correlative pairs that construct balance in the universe, orient spiritual practices, and organize human relationships to the natural and spiritual worlds, and to one another. These concepts are fundamental aspects of mo‘okū‘auhau and in particular the Kumulipo. They are also the terms appropriated by Calvinist

missionaries as they worked to convert ‘ōiwi through the use of their own language while also representing key divisions in Christianity—the unsaved and saved, the heathen and civilized, and the ignorant and enlightened. What stands out in interrogating this period and these ideas, is both the extent of change incurred and constancy maintained in these conceptualizations against a larger backdrop of a society in transformation, a society managing Christian influence and encumbered by the ailing health of the lāhui. It should be noted, according to Cook, that for many ‘ōiwi, including the most devout and dogmatic, a “situational understanding of that relationship” between pō and ao was retained and “the older meanings could occasionally override their training” (Cook 2011, 41). The following section examines pō and ao in the context of the Kumulipo and in association with introduced Christian ideas to examine the “older meanings” Cook refers to alongside aspects of new Christian training. The section considers the life that is encompassed in these notions of pō and ao in both their ‘ōiwi and Christian contexts.

Hānau Ka Pō

Pō and ao are paired as organizational devices in origin traditions found in Hawai‘i and in the broader Pacific. Pō represents the period of cosmic development and ao its completion. In the Kumulipo the development of the universe unfolds in sixteen wā (time periods), seven in pō and nine in ao. The chant is over two thousand lines long and was composed entirely within ‘ōiwi oral tradition. It is the longest and most well preserved origin tradition found anywhere in the Pacific. The Kumulipo is considered both an oli ho‘okumu honua, a chant that establishes the earth, and as mentioned in Chapter 1 a pule ho‘ola‘a ali‘i, a prayer that sanctifies the chief. It encompasses both life and politics crafted within its genealogical framework.

In the Kumulipo, the universe begins in darkness and chaos, heat and movement, shadow and slime. The land and sky are turned over and then set in their proper position. The sun stands in shadow producing the visible light shining from the moon. Makali‘i¹² rises and conscious time begins. The prologue of the first wā orders the temporal and spatial components of pō and reiterates its fullness, its darkness, its connection to the shades of color found in the deep ocean, ka lipolipo, the source of life on earth. In pō (earthly) life is born, beginning with the first elemental progenitor pair, Kumulipo, a male form and the source of deep-sea darkness, and Pō‘ele, his female counterpart, a black darkness symbolic of an embryo. Their first offspring is the uku ko‘ako‘a, the coral polyp. In this first wā cosmic origins are ordered based on the dualities represented in ‘ōiwi intellectual traditions that establish balance brought into being through sexuality and procreation. Through these pairings the universe unfolds in a multiplicity of births during the long epochs of time constituted in pō. Although it is earthly life that is born, the births occur in the darkness of the spirit world and are considered godly. The life forms born in pō are ancestors to humans and are imbued with the mana of the spirit world and born of the sexual energy of the godly pō. From a human standpoint they are both akua and relatives.

In the space and time of pō only god enters—o ke akua ke komo, the godly male elemental and procreative force enters the female elemental procreative darkness—‘a‘oe komo kanaka—humans do not enter. These earlier life forms born in pō include marine invertebrates, seaweeds, land plants, marine vertebrates, winged insects, birds, reptiles and animals with carapace, pigs, rats, dogs, and bats. These life forms develop in

¹² The constellation Pleiades.

complexity and culminate in the birth of the most complex organism, humans. Humans are the last born entities emerging from pō into ao and are intimately connected to all of the life forms born before as one venerable mo‘okū‘auhau. In this perspective of interrelation “human life does not play a central role in the totality of life, but is only a small and insignificant part of it” (Lemm 2009, 3).

The wā in pō and ao represented in the Kumulipo can be interpreted on multiple levels extending horizontally and vertically. The first horizontal level of interpretation is genealogical as described above. The Kumulipo is a mo‘okū‘auhau that accounts for the connections between cosmic origins, plant and animal life, and human beings in one familial line pushing Wolfe’s aspiration for a “biopolitical point [that] is no longer human vs. animal; the biopolitical point is a newly expanded community of the living” (Wolfe 2013, 105). The second horizontal level of meaning relates to the development of the child from gestation to birth through childhood and culminating in adulthood. The wā in pō represent the developmental stages of gestation through childhood, and adulthood is conveyed in the periods of ao. Rubellite Kawena Johnson describes the kaona (hidden meanings) of the second level of interpretation found in the first wā.

Not only ‘heat’ (wela) is felt, but also ‘pain’ (wela). How is it felt? By the honua, which is a placenta, as of the earth’s placenta and the human placenta. When the placenta pains (wela) then the ‘chief’ (sky) reverses its position to be born. The spasm of pain (wela) when the human infant is near birth reverses the head so that its position is downward in order to be born. (2000, 39)

The composer’s skill is conveyed through the seamless integration of the diverse elements of the mo‘okū‘auhau including the systems of organization and the connection between the development of the universe and the growth of the human being (Charlot 1983, 125). The other horizontal levels of interpretation are concerned with cultural and

political history, the ‘ōiwi year, and the ‘ōiwi day. The relationships formed between the first human (anthropomorphic) siblings—La‘ila‘i, Ki‘i, Kāne—underline some of these interpretations. The levels also speak to the theoretical and methodological aspects of the chant. In pō life begins, sex abounds, and procreation is paramount. In ao the same aspects exist alongside the development of human cultural and political enterprises and conditions.

Turning back to pō, it is important to note that it is also the realm to which we return after our physical bodies have died. Mary Kawena Pukui writes,

In Pō there dwell our ancestors, transfigured into gods... Yet they are forever our relatives, having for us the loving concern a mother feels for her infant, or a grandfather for his first-born grandson. As gods and relatives in one, they give us strength when we are weak, warning when danger threatens, guidance in our bewilderment, inspiration in our arts... These are our spiritual parents. These are our aumākua (1972, 35).

Emerging from pō and returning to it reiterates the continuity of mo‘okū‘auhau. The original cosmic pō is a female godly entity that the male godly entity slips into—he pou he‘e i ka wawa. The male slipping into female darkness is decidedly sexual and procreative. In essence, ‘ōiwi women recreate the cosmic act and it is in the womb where the spirit is transferred from one dimension, pō, to the growing child who is born in ao (Jensen and Jensen 2005, 65). When earthly existence has ended we return to that dimension, as Pukui asserts, “You and I, when our time comes, shall plunge from our leina into Pō” (Ibid). Johnson, in considering the relationship between gods and humans present in the Kumulipo, puts it another way, “It is your own infant being that once was not awake. You are the watcher, and you are seeing yourself emerge as the deity (akua) emerges... You have entered into the world as all others before you entered, but in

another sense you have always been there, at one time yet unborn” (2000, 30). Pō is a timeless realm of eternal life. Ao is the place of our earthly (corporeal) existence.

Contrasting pō and ao as formulated in the Kumulipo with Christian perspectives underlines the very different orientations to gods, nature, and other humans that exist between the two and that ‘ōiwi in the 19th century engaged. Charlot in evaluating the global spread of Christianity holds that, “In almost each place, there was an intellectual effort to see the similar points between the old and new religions and develop a theology that would join them in a broader, more satisfying Christian view...Hawai‘i is a curious exception to this history” (2010, 29). In other parts of the world Christianity and the culture in contact were both transformed and ideas assimilated across cultural and religious boundaries. However, in Hawai‘i “missionaries rejected completely the previous religious experience of the Hawaiians and demanded that they start a completely new religious and intellectual life” (Ibid, 30). Part of this conflict between the old and the new played out in the polytheism of ‘ōiwi, especially in regard to the meanings and values associated with pō.

For Calvinist missionaries the problem centered on control. In ‘ōiwi constructions of pō the influence and manipulation of mana determined power and authority, which extended to the spirit world. In pō, as envisioned in the Kumulipo, no single, ultimate, or almighty entity controlled or directed the mana that abounded within its realm and resulted in the multiple forms of life that were born. Pō simply exists (Cook 2011, 40). Moreover, life born in pō is engendered through procreation, which requires two sources of mana, male and female. In Christianity the ultimate source of creation and mana is held by one supreme God. For life to emerge within a procreation oriented worldview a

dual source of mana is necessary and Kumulipo and Pō‘ele represent the first parent pair in the Kumulipo because the “mainstream Hawaiian tradition was procreational” (Charlot 2010, 37). Additionally, the association with darkness and a realm that was not ruled or controlled by any one entity further complicated the clear cut divide presented in Christianity between God and Satan.

Satan’s domain is darkness, light and day are the domains of God. The mana of both Satan and God is derived and directed from their control over darkness and light. The emphasis placed on the afterlife and salvation in Christianity underlined the concern indicated in respect to the saved/unsaved division (Cook 2011, 37). This division in Christianity between dark and light, Satan and God, unsaved and saved cannot be clearly made in conceptions of pō and ao as they are expressed in the Kumulipo. The correlative pairs that produce pono function as opposites that complement one another. Rather than presenting a struggle between opposing forces, the pairs represent binary components necessary to the order of the universe. Pō and ao in the associated terms of pouli and mālamalama are representative of Satan’s evil and God’s good. As opposing dualistic pairs they are always in conflict as indicated in John 3:19-20,

Eia ka mea i ho‘āhewa ‘ia ai; ua hiki mai ka mālamalama i ke ao nei, akā, ua makemake nā kānaka i ka pouli, ‘a‘ole i ka mālamalama, no ka mea, ua hewa nā hana ‘ana a lākou. ‘O ka mea e hana ana i nā mea ‘ino, ‘o ia ke ho‘owahāwahā i ka mālamalama, ‘a‘ole ho‘i ia e hele mai i ka mālamalama, o ‘ikea auane‘i kāna hana ‘ana. (BH 2012)

Their sentence is based on this fact: that the Light from heaven came into the world, but they loved the darkness more than the Light, for their deeds were evil. They hated the heavenly Light because they wanted to sin in the darkness. They stayed away from that Light for fear their sins would be exposed and they would be punished. (KJV 2000)

Although missionaries encouraged ‘ōiwi to reject their old religious and intellectual

practices, poetic expressions from the 19th century show the syncretic ways in which ‘ōiwi integrated traditional conceptualizations of pō and life with new Christian ones. These compositions demonstrate that ‘ōiwi “understood the biblical account of the universe in the context of such Hawaiian traditions, best represented now by the great Kumulipo” (Charlot 2010, 36). One example can be found in a composition by the ali‘i wahine Kekupuohi, a member of Liholiho’s court who converted to Christianity after missionaries arrived in the islands. She died an exemplary Christian able to represent her ‘ōiwi worldview in combination with newly acquired Christian doctrine. The chant she composed blends ‘ōiwi and Christian concepts and reflects upon the Biblical account of Genesis, skillfully managing the key difference between the two traditions—the problem of creation to a procreationist worldview (Ibid, 36). The chant is presented below in modern orthography. The translation is by John Charlot (Ibid, 43-4).

1. Hā ke Akua i ka lewa!	The God breathed into space!
2. Hohola ka mana, hohola.	The power spread
3. Lele ho‘olalahai ka ‘Uhane	The spirit flew as poised aloft
4. He ‘Uhane he aka no ka mea maika‘i	A Spirit, a shadow of the good person
5. He akalani nō ka ‘Uhane Hemolelo.	A sky/chiefly shadow indeed is the Perfect Spirit.
6. ‘Apo mai ka mana i ka nakele i pa‘a	The power grasped the molten to make it firm
7. I pa‘a ka nakanaka o lewa wale nō	To firm up the rifts lest there be only yawning space
8. I pa‘a i ka mana i ka mana‘o	Firmed up by the power, by the intended plan
9. Ho‘okino ai ka honua.	By which to give body to the earth.
10. Ua ea pū, ea ka moku.	They rose together, the island rose up.
11. ‘Ōlohelohe ka ‘āina	The land was bare
12. ‘Alaneo ka honua	The earth was clear
13. He lepo wale nō.	Only soil.
14. He lepo ke kanaka	Soil was the human being.
15. Nā kea Akua i hana.	By the God was he made.
16. Nāna nō i hana i nā mea ā pau.	By the God were made all things indeed.
17. Ho‘oulu mai lā i nā mea uliuli.	He made the green things grow forth.
18. Kāhiko ka honua i ka mea maika‘i.	The earth was adorned by the good person.

19. Ho‘onani mai i ka pua o ka lā‘au	He made beautiful the flowers and fruits of the tree
20. I nani ka honua.	So the earth would be beautiful.
21. Na ke Akua ia.	This was done by the God.
22. Na ke Akua i hana ka lani nui nei	By the God was made this great sky
23. I hana i ka lani mamao li‘uli‘u	He made the sky as almost invisibly distant
24. I ho‘opa‘a i ka lani i wahi noho.	He fixed the sky as a settled dwelling place.
25. Noho ho‘okahi Iehova, ‘o ia wale nō	Jehovah lived as one alone, only he
26. ‘O ka ‘Uhane ka lua.	The Spirit was the second.
27. ‘O ka mana kona mea i lehulehu ai	The power was his means of making increase
28. Lehu ā kini ā nalowale	The many, the multitude, the innumerable
29. Ā piha ka lani, piha nō ka honua	Until the sky was filled, the earth was filled indeed
30. Piha i ka pono, i ka mana, i ka maika‘i	Filled with rightness, power, goodness
31. I ka nani, i ka hemolele, i ke ahonui.	Beauty, perfection, patience.
32. He mea nui wale nō nāna	By him were made great things only
33. Na ke Akua lokomaika‘i	By the God of good insides
34. I nui wale ai ho‘ihā ka lani	So that the sky would be great indeed
35. He nui ka lani me ka honua	Great the sky and the earth
36. He nui ka mauna me ke kai	Great the mountain and the sea
37. He mea hana wale nō na ke Akua	A creation only by the God
38. Na kona mana wale nō.	By his power alone.
39. ‘O ko ka lā wahi nō i kau ai	The sun has its own place to occupy.
40. ‘O ka moku na‘e ke huli ana, huli ka moku	But the globe is turning, the globe turns
41. Palamino, palanehe‘ole, pala‘ole. Silently, noiselessly, leaving no trace.	
42. ‘A‘ole kākou e ‘ike i kana ‘oihana akamai.	We ourselves do not see his intelligent craft.
43. ‘O ke Akua ke ko‘oko‘o nui e pa‘a ai ka honua.	The God himself is the great prop that fixes the earth.

Kekupuohi introduces “changes and uses Hawaiian concepts and emphases that transform the account into an original understanding of Christianity...she seems to feel that as long as she upholds the main point of God’s creation and power, she can work out the details in a Hawaiian way” (Ibid, 37). One of those details is the division between pō and ao.

To avoid the problem of the Christian God’s presence at the origin of the universe Kekupuohi omits the pō/ao pairing from her composition. Origins within ‘ōiwi tradition arise out of the pō, the space and time of godly ancestors. God’s presence in darkness is

contrary to the Christian divide between good and evil, salvation and damnation, knowledge and ignorance. Understanding this contrast Kekupuohi uses the term *aka* to emphasize the primordial darkness found in the first half of cosmic development while not directly referring to that darkness. *Aka* is a word used in the *Kumulipo* to denote the sun standing in shadow, *kūka‘iaka ka lā*. The sun is present and gives light to the moon that shines brightly in the first stage of cosmic development. Kekupuohi’s chant unveils new references in using *aka*, “He ‘Uthane he aka no ka mea maika‘i/ He akalani nō ka ‘Uthane Hemolele [A spirit, a shadow of the good person/ A sky/chiefly shadow indeed is the Perfect Spirit]” (Ibid, 43). Although she avoids darkness as a central theme, she “does not hurry to disperse explicitly the darkness by light” as one would expect within a Christian composition (Ibid, 38). Kekupuohi draws on her ‘ōiwi understandings to bridge traditional conceptions of cosmic development with new Christian perspectives.

Hewahewa, the great kahuna of Kamehameha I also composed an early Christian ‘ōiwi chant. Again, I use John Charlot’s English translation and modern orthography (Ibid, 35).

1. Kū, kū lā ia, kū lā	Stand, stand there, stand there
2. Piha kū lālani, kū lā	Stand in full rows, stand there
3. O pouli lā, pō‘ele‘ele lā	Lest you be in the dark night there, black night there
4. ‘Ōpū kalakala. Lau‘ia, e kū lā	Bristly, unreceptive insides. Crowd together stand there.
5. He Akua nui, he Akua mana	A great god, a powerful god
6. He Akua ola, he Akua mau	A living god, a lasting god
7. Iehova ke kamahale mai ka lani mai.	Jehovah, the main branch from the sky.
8. He Akua noho i ka ‘iu‘iu	A god living in the greatest distance
9. ‘O ka welelau o ka makani	On the tip of the wind
10. I loko o ke ao ka‘a lelewa	Inside the cloud rolling in the distant space
11. He ‘ohu kū i ka honua.	A mist standing on the earth
12. He ‘ōnohi kū i ka moana.	A rainbow circle standing in the ocean.
13. Iesu ko kākou kalahala	Jesus, our loosener of faults,
14. Mai ke ala i Kahiki ā Hawai‘i nei	From the path of Kahiki to Hawai‘i here

15. Mai ka ho'oku'i ā ka hālāwai.	From the zenith to the horizon.
16. 'Ehu'ehu ka ua mai ka lani	The rain sprays towards us from the sky
17. Iehova 'Ī, ka makemake.	Jehovah the Highest, our desire.
18. Hīmeni i ka lani ka'akua	Hymn the rolling sky.
19. He olioli/'oli'oli nei ka honua.	The earth chants/rejoices.
21. 'O ka 'ike, 'o ka mana, 'o ke ola.	Knowledge, power, life.
22. Hālāwai i ke alo o Poki	Meet before the face of Boki
23. I ke alo o ka haku mana mau.	Before the face of the lord of lasting power.
24. Pule pono iā Iehova	Pray correctly to Jehovah
25. I kahuna mana no nā moku	For a powerful priest for the islands
26. Me he lama 'ike hewa nui	Like a torch to see the great fault/Hewa
27. I ola mākou ā pau	So that we may all live
28. I ola iā Iesu.	Live though Jesus.
29. 'Amene.	Amen.

Although Kekupuohi avoided the use of pō, Hewahewa incorporates it at the start of his chant through both 'ōiwi and Christian understandings, “O pouli lā, pō'ele'ele lā [Lest you be in the dark night there, black night there]” (Ibid 35). Hewahewa contrasts the old with the new as Kekupuohi did. He incorporates the darkness found at the origin of the universe reiterating its importance to cosmic development while also alluding to the darkness of the 'ōiwi mind without God and Christianity. Here pō, and especially pouli is used to denote na'aupō, ignorance of the Christian message. Hewahewa's following line insinuates the resistance he foresees some 'ōiwi having to the Christian message. “'Ōpu kalakala. Lau 'ia, e kū lā [Bristly, unreceptive insides. Crowd together, stand there]” (Ibid). Although Hewahewa proclaims his acceptance of the new Christian God through the chant, he does so in a framework that elicits his supremacy as the highest ranking kahuna organizing ceremonies and directing participants, as he surely did during the reign of Kamehameha I. Charlot argues that Hewahewa “expected to lead the worship of the new god in Hawai'i” and made himself available to the missionaries but was kept at a distance eventually returning to the worship of his own gods (Ibid, 34).

Ua Ao

Ao, in the Kumulipo constitutes the birth of humans in day or light. The 8th wā begins in pō reiterating the procreative power of the earlier periods establishing life through sex in the godly darkness. Kikiloi suggests that this move from night to day or darkness to light was religiously and thus politically significant. He writes, “This transition was an important aspect of Hawaiian religion as it helped to explain the world of spirits and gods as they were brought into relations with human descendants” (Kikiloi 2012, 29). This relationship was a significant aspect of ‘ōiwi genealogical understandings as well as religious and political practices. Humans and gods are of the same family line. Further, humans relied on the gods to be successful in their earthly (political and religious) endeavors. The divide between pō and ao envisioned in the Kumulipo draws out the relationships between gods and the forms of life born in pō with the human realm of ao, as pō is the source of godly mana necessary for success in religious and political activities undertaken by humans born in the space and time of ao. The divide based on Christian theology only relates humans to ao through a connection with an almighty God whose domain is light. The gods of pō represent the heathen past to the Christian mind. Kekupuohi reimagines this divide by using hā (breath) referenced in God’s creation of man found in Genesis 2:7, “a hā ihola i ka hanu ola i loko o nā puka ihu ona” (BH 2012); “and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” (KJV 2000). Man, in Genesis, is given life through God’s breath emphasizing the separation between man and the rest of creation (Charlot 2010, 37). Kekupuohi’s chant takes this notion and expands it to cosmic beginnings. Her opening line states, “Hā ke Akua i ka lewa! [The God breathed into space!]” (Ibid, 43). Charlot maintains that by having God breathe into space as he did into man in Genesis, “the universe is directly and physically connected”

to him, which affirms “an idea nearer to a genealogical connection than to that between creator and creation” (Ibid, 37). Charlot further asserts both the creative quality of Kekupuohi’s chant and her affirmation of two important Hawaiian ideas, “that the universe is good and that human beings and the universe are on a family tree and thus share the same cosmic forces” (Ibid). Though not entirely synonymous with the transition from pō to ao in the Kumulipo or with Genesis, Kekupuohi draws close associations with the traditional conceptualizations of a shared genealogical line and cosmic development through adopting and adapting Christian usage of breath. Moreover, in her composition she asserts both ‘ōiwi and Christian views of the universe as ‘good’ despite the disparate ways both worldviews envision its construction between the realms of pō and ao.

Though humans had no place in pō at the origin of the universe, in the Kumulipo ao marks the time and space of anthropomorphic gods, human procreation and cultural production commencing with the relationship between the first siblings. The 8th wā of the Kumulipo ends in light when the first human entities are born. La‘ila‘i, a female, is the eldest. The births of Ki‘i, a human man and Kāne and Kanaloa, two male akua. All four are siblings. La‘ila‘i represents female sexuality and procreative power, she is the life giving force populating the earth with humans in a manner similar to the original female cosmic pō. La‘ila‘i is embodied in later wā as Haumea and Papa who expand the mo‘okū‘auhau and contribute to social and political dimensions of ‘ōiwi society in equally important ways. Sexuality and desire are common themes attributed to women in mo‘olelo. For example, ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui deduces that sexuality and desire in the Pele literature speak to Pele’s mana based partially on her “authority and ability to

overpower males, both godly and human” (2008, 31). Although Pele does not give birth to humans, her procreative powers manifest in the birth of land through volcanic activity, a similar theme presented in the mo‘okū‘auhau of Papa and Wākea discussed previously. Moreover, Pele’s sexual exploits are an integral part of the literature that exalts her mana in much the same way that God’s word and light exalt his power in Christian writing. La‘ila‘i shares qualities with both Pele and Papa. She is the procreative source (and mana) birthing multiple generations through her sexual relationships with her brothers Ki‘i and Kāne establishing the chiefly tradition of nī‘aupi‘o, incestuous mating to increase mana, and the broader societal practice of punalua (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 40-43).

Nī‘aupi‘o was an important chiefly tradition as demonstrated in the mo‘okū‘auhau of Papa and Wākea and in the Kumulipo. Incestuous mating among chiefs raised the genealogy of offspring above the parents “giving them divine status” and drawing them closer to the akua (Kikilo 2010, 82). Pukui argues that this type of mating was “not incest as the West knows it, but a positive way to insure that high mana was reinforced and passed down to heir and future ruler” (Pukui et al 1978, 151). Punalua refers to “two springs” or having two lovers “either at the same time or one right after the other” (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 43). Punalua relationships often resulted in po‘olua (two heads) children, keiki who could claim two fathers. Kame‘eleihiwa explains, “Po‘olua, in genealogical reckoning, raised the child’s mana because he or she could claim illustrious ancestors from three sides, that of two fathers and one mother” (Ibid). The Christian view of sexual and familial relationships is, of course, quite different. In Hebera (Hebrews) 13:4 the difference is explained, “E mahalo ‘ia ka mare no nā mea a pau, a e ho‘opaumā‘ele ‘ole ‘ia ho‘i kahi moe: no ka mea, e ho‘āhewa mai ana nō ke Akua i ka

po‘e ho‘oipoipo, a me ka po‘e moekolohe” (BH 2012); “Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge” (KJV 2000). Though the translation is not exact, the sense is clear. Marriage and sex is condoned between a husband and a wife.

In the early 19th century moral codes began to shift and “alcohol, prostitution, all manner of non-religious activity on Sundays, hula, gambling, polygamy, and whatever else the mission fathers portrayed as hewa, sinful” was banned (Cook 2011, 34). This included familial relationships like punalua and incestuous relationships like *nī‘aupi‘o*.¹³ Moreover, in so much as Pele, La‘ila‘i, and Haumea actively express and represent female sexuality and desire, to the point of being able to overpower men, Ephesians 5:22 dictates that Christian women are expected to “e noho ma lalo o nā kāne pono‘ī a ‘oukou, e like me kā ka Haku” (BH 2012) “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord” (KJV 2000). A relation to power—between husbands and wives and in procreative and sexual choice— is clear here and an obvious reversal to female sexual power exhibited by Pele, La‘ila‘i, Haumea and by extension ‘ōiwi women. Instead, sex (particularly for women) is no longer in a positive relation with power but “rooted in a specific and irreducible urgency which power tries as best it can to dominate...it enables one to conceive power solely as law and taboo” (Foucault 1990, 152).

La‘ila‘i is symbolic of female procreative and sexual energy while Ki‘i and Kāne personify the dynamic between humans and gods in the quest for power and dominance. Ki‘i as the eldest male gains authority over Kāne by having a sexual and procreative relationship with La‘ila‘i first, despite being a human. Kāne and La‘ila‘i also engage in a

¹³ Kauikeaouli, KIII had a *nī‘aupi‘o* relationship with his sister Nahi‘ena‘ena despite missionary insistence of the *hewa* of this type of relationship.

sexual relationship however their akua-like children are the junior lineage to Ki‘i and La‘ila‘i’s human children. The relationship between Ki‘i and Kāne illustrates the relationship between humans and gods, and especially men and gods, in religious practice. Ki‘i as the embodiment of men, is able to harness the mana of his brother, the akua (Kāne) through carving godly images (kālai ki‘i). These godly images are present at the heiau where men worship the four main male akua. However, men are reliant on these godly images and their mana to be successful in their human pursuits. Valerio Valeri writes that the relationship between the two brothers as described in the Kumulipo suggests that “man’s dependence on gods, in fact conceals the gods’ dependence on man” (1985, 7). Reciprocity between gods and men as shared sources of mana framed in the Kumulipo is indicative of broader societal practices that underline the shared responsibilities based on genealogical connection also seen in human relationships with the natural environment. Ephesians 4:6 demonstrates that in Christian thinking God is the only and the almighty source of power, “Ho‘okahi ho‘i Akua, ka Makua o nā mea a pau, ‘o ia ma luna o nā mea a pau, ma nā mea apau a i loko ho‘i o kākou a pau” (BH 2012); “One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all” (KJV 2000). Though God is in and around all, He is the ultimate source of mana. Reciprocity and shared responsibilities are outside of the realm of relationships between humans and God. Humans are expected to obey the will and word of God.

In as much as the wā in ao are related to humans and human religious and political activities, Christian use of ao in reference to the light of God took on an intellectual and educational connotation. Light allows one to see and to know as a civilized being linked to God as is so clearly expressed in the Bible. Moreover,

knowledge through light is typically expressed in connection with the word of God. I turn again to Ioane (John) 1:1-5,

I kinohi ka Logou, me ke Akua ka Logou, a o ke Akua nō ka Logou. Me ke Akua nō ho‘i ia i kinohi. Hana ‘ia ihola nā mea a pau e ia; ‘a‘ole kekahi mea i hana ‘ia i hana ‘ole ‘ia e ia. I loko ona ke ola, a ‘o ua ola lā ka mālamalama no nā kākaka. Puka maila ka mālamalama i loko o ka pouli, ‘a‘ole na‘e i ho‘okipa ka pouli iā ia. (BH 2012)

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was the light of all mankind. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it. (KJV 2000)

Na‘aupō (ignorance) and na‘auao (enlightenment) were the terms used in missionary rhetoric to denote those who were uneducated and thus uncivilized, and those who were enlightened and civilized reiterating the divide between Christian and ‘ōiwi conceptualizations of pō and ao. Inherently connected to these meanings was conversion to Christianity. Converts became na‘auao because they had heard the word of God and denounced “any remnants of Polytheism” that marked their previous state of na‘aupō. Na‘au as defined in Pukui and Elbert’s Hawaiian Dictionary, refers to “intestines, bowels, guts” (1983, 257) Silva metaphorically extends the physicality of na‘au as part of the body to “thoughts, feelings (one’s interior self)” (2004, 59). She contends that the application of the terms na‘auao and na‘aupō in reference to ‘ōiwi underlined the “assumption in this discourse that haole ways of life are na‘auao and Kanaka ways are na‘aupō” and it was the missionaries’ task “to fight all that was na‘aupō and replace it with ways that were na‘auao” (Ibid). Na‘aupō applied to ‘ōiwi intellectually and religiously was also intertwined with the missionaries’ perspective on whether or not

‘ōiwi possessed the abilities to govern their own Kingdom. Historian Ronald Williams, argues that during Kalākaua’s administration leaders of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA) began to narrow their designation of Christian “in an attempt to delineate true Christians from those who supported the crown” (2013, 40). This reputedly alienated a number of ‘ōiwi congregants who much to the dismay of church leaders were vocal in their dissatisfaction with HEA leadership and their call for a change to the “heathen” government in favor of “white rule” (Ibid, 46). This move on the part of HEA leaders to more strictly define the proper Christian, to take ownership of Christianity after decades of missionization, and to impose white rule bears striking resemblance to what Esposito refers to in his analysis of what constitutes personhood. Here the proper ‘ōiwi Christian (if that is even possible) is both na‘auao, enlightened by the word of God, and willing to be dominated by white rulers and is therefore “endowed with consciousness and therefore capable of self-determination” and the distinction of personhood (Esposito 2015, 53). The ‘ōiwi who supports the crown are considered na‘aupō, uncivilized, and therefore incapable of self-governance, Christian grace or the designation of person. Esposito writes, “All individuals may belong to the species of Homo sapiens, but only some, and only for a limited time, enter into the territory of the person” (Ibid, 52). For ‘ōiwi supporters of Kalākaua that territory was outside their realm of being.

Ola Hou and Eternal Life

As illuminated in the Kumulipo, life is conceptualized as multiple, related bodies endowed with mana emanating from the spiritual realm of pō, physically embodied in ao,

and passed from one generation to the next in mo‘okū‘auhau, with the express understanding of the eventual return to the eternal realm of pō. The eternal realm of pō as a continuation of life overlaps with the Christian idea of ola hou, everlasting life in God’s heavenly realm. Ola hou could only be achieved through conversion to Christianity and missionaries asserted the idea that ‘ōiwi were dying of introduced diseases due to their heathen past and thus needed to turn toward God to save their immortal souls and attain everlasting life. Amid the collapse of the population the prospect of a new and eternal life as escape from ever present death may have been a comforting notion. Moreover, the theme of eternal life traverses Western religious and philosophical tradition, categories present within mo‘okū‘auhau as well. As in the West, these traditions have impacted ‘ōiwi relations to power. While there are striking differences between the ways in which Western notions of biopower and ‘ōiwi orientations toward life were conceived there are also some compelling similarities the comparison of which could lead to a greater grasp of conceptions of life across philosophical terrains.

There are three interconnected ideas associated with eternal life that I find particularly relevant to ‘ōiwi conceptions of pō as eternal and its relation to ao and by extension, a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau: the body, immanence, and animality. Thinking through the body (as a facet of the individual and as population) as a dimension of eternal life (how the body is conceptualized)—as material and spiritual—is pertinent to an apprehension of immanence that is further brought to bear in mo‘okū‘auhau. In addition, wrestling with the confluence of these ideas sheds light on the possibility of expanded notions of life referred to in the 1874 electioneering material and in the genealogical debates surrounding Queen Emma and Kalākaua. Ola, ola hou, and eternal life are

layered and constructed in overlapping conceptual landscapes and read as references in the proclamations made by both candidates illuminates the breadth of their political concerns for the lāhui.

Miguel Vatter argues that both Aristotle and Spinoza perceive eternal life as corresponding to the life of the mind, a contemplative life, a life beyond animal life. But within that view rests an aporia,

The human being is capable of this form of life because, like God, she is endowed with reason: at the same time, the human is incapable of sustaining this form of life because, unlike God, she is endowed with a body, or better, with a zoe (2014, 264).

In this configuration life cannot be eternal, it dies with the body. Vatter suggests that in order to think about eternal life beyond the limits placed on the body or zoē, the body cannot be understood as a “tomb.” Instead, Vatter urges a consideration of how the “body and sentient life also philosophize” (Ibid). Or as Deleuze suggests, “we shouldn’t enclose life in the single moment when individual life confronts universal death” (Deleuze 2005, 29). Vatter contends that the eternalization principle read in Spinoza is found in the way we exist, our bios, which, according to Spinoza is driven by conatus or “the effort that all things make in order to persevere in their being” (Vatter 2014, 265). Vatter defends the idea that “if God and all other things share a univocity of being, then these things must be as eternal as their immanent cause” (Ibid, 265). In his assessment of Spinoza’s conception of immanence, “the life of each thing is the immanent cause of each thing, that is, life is that whereby each thing remains within God” (Ibid, 266). In working through the arguments set forth by Spinoza and Aristotle, Vatter contends that Spinoza’s objection to the Aristotelian conception of life as the operation of the intellect

“aim[s] at making it possible to attribute life to all things because all things are in God and God is (eternal) life” (Ibid). The physical body is immaterial because it is continuously reproduced by individuals within the species, “the only manner in which life can come into being and disappear from being” as an act of imitating the life of God (Ibid, 281).

Esposito posits a similar notion in the reproduction of life of the species but emphasizes the relation of bodies within the species to mankind beyond its grasp by the Church or the state. He writes, “Belonging neither to the state nor to the Church, nor exclusively to the person that dwells inside it, the body owes its inviolability to the fact that it is eminently common...in the more powerful sense that each human body is the patrimony of humanity as a whole” (Esposito 2015, 107). This is not entirely unlike a conception of pō and the mana that emanates from it that is then dispersed in mo‘okū‘auhau.

A general conception of mana connotes the power of life found in all beings and may be considered in a similar frame of reference as the notion of immanence. The eternal source of this power derives from the godly realm of pō and is carried in the ‘bodies’ existing in ao and inherited by future generations. Although for humans mana often manifests as “an inherent quality of command and leadership. A reservoir of strength” and thus is associated as an important quality for ali‘i, mana exists in everything, in all ‘bodies’, from rocks, to water, to animals, to knowledge, to skill, to names and words, it is everywhere and it is eternal (Pukui et al 1972, 150). Mana is also the power that connects all beings as related in mo‘okū‘auhau. Moreover, in considering the driving force or power of life sustained in mana in the Kumulipo and more generally

in pō, the conatus that links each living being one to another and to the gods, is sex.

Whereas in Vatter's analysis the "dependence of each being on God is nothing other than the conatus of each being" in mo'okū'auhau each being is associated with gods but dependent on and realized through sex (Vatter 2014, 268). The conatus here is derived from cosmic desire birthing the earliest and simplest forms of life—uku ko'ako'a—and its most evolved—humans—in a linked chain from one to the other as eternal as the principle is for Spinoza.

Deleuze engages immanence in ways relatable to mana as well. Deleuze writes, "A life is everywhere, in all the moments that a given living subject goes through and that are measured by given lived objects: an immanent life carrying with it the events or singularities that are merely actualized in subjects and objects" (Deleuze 2005, 28). The same argument may be made for mana as it flows through and is actualized (being as a life) in the various subjects and objects in the 'ōiwi intellectual, physical, and political landscapes. The idea of a life for Deleuze stems from the philosophy of Johann Fichte who presents it as a transcendental field that is "no longer dependent on a Being or submitted to an Act—it is an absolute immediate consciousness whose very activity no longer refers to a being but is ceaselessly posed in a life" (Ibid, 27). For Esposito, this is where bios comes into play. The move from the life to a life in Deleuze's reckoning of immanence marks the break from the dimension of individual consciousness and is therefore "not attributable to the form of the individual or of the person" (Esposito 2008, 192). Mana can be grasped, in relation to both a life and the life, as singular or personal and diffuse, but it always has a mystical quality the origin of which is the godliness of pō (Pukui et al 1972, 151-3). Deleuze apprehends immanence as a differentiating process.

“The singularities and the events that constitute a life coexist with the accidents of the life that corresponds to it, but they are neither grouped nor divided in the same way” (Deleuze 2005, 29). Mana is specific in that it embodies and effects individual consciousness but it is also omnipresent and can be divided or directed specifically and in a general manner. In other words, mana is in all beings “emitted from a rock, the bones of the dead, the medicine that cures or the potion that kills” (Pukui et al 1972, 151). It can also be bestowed on an individual and specifically directed. Hā, for example, plays an important role in the passage of knowledge and mana. In as much as God enlivens man through his breath, hā imparts mana. Pukui asserts, “the mana of hā was a talent or natural aptitude” rather than the diffuse mana of authority or power (1972, 44). A kupuna (elder/grandparent) bestowed their hā to a junior member of the family so that they may carry on the elder’s knowledge of a specific craft such as canoe building or hula (Ibid, 44-5). The practice of passing on mana through hā “prevented family doubts or disputes regarding who was entitled to the mana” it also infused pride in the chosen descendant (Ibid, 45). For Spinoza immanence is found in univocity with God. But for Deleuze, there is no one substance where immanence is derived instead “One is always the index of a multiplicity” (Deleuze 2005, 30). The shape of mana (and its relation to immanence) may be partially understood in the combination of both notions, as stemming from a godly source and as “virtualities, events, singularities” (Ibid).

Moving away from an abstract conception of immanence to an applied understanding of mana and a configuration of the body as having eternal material qualities draws out some of the differences between ‘ōiwi philosophy and current biopolitical theory. Esposito maintains, “in order for life to be conceived in the first

place, life needs some type of organic representation binding it to reality, or at least the potential of a bodily structure” (Esposito 2013b, 317). We can see that in the Kumulipo, as in all mo‘okū‘auhau, there is both the conception and potential for bodily structures that begin in pō and manifest in ao. However, if the body is the site for the unfolding of life, it is also the location of death, a problem enunciated by the thanatopolitical declension that has “tended to paralyze biopolitical thought” (Wolfe 2013, 103). The body is always already dying and once dead “the body does not endure” making it imperative to seek a conception of eternal life outside of the body’s limit (Esposito 2014, 318). The central struggle for both Deleuze and Agamben according to Vatter “is to understand what it means for each and every being to remain within God without being God: how to eternalize one’s life without being immortal” (Vatter 2014, 280). In other words, how to escape the parameters of the body. This problematic can be read differently in mo‘okū‘auhau through the material and immaterial aspects of iwi (bones).

If mana derives from the godly realm of pō and is substantiated in the realm of ao through birth, it settles and is protected in iwi. Blood was considered haumia or defiling as was the decaying flesh of the dead. But even after the flesh has decayed and there is nothing that remains of the physical body but iwi, mana is maintained. In bones the body is eternalized and life made immortal through the retention of mana that is the connection to the godly ancestral realm. Bones were the lasting remains of the person who once lived. If iwi were the receptacle of mana that was valued in death, they were equally significant in life. In ‘ōiwi conceptions, “Even the bones of the living became symbols of the link between man’s progenitors and his own eventual immortality” (Pukui et al 1978, 107). In other words, mo‘okū‘auhau is a focal point even in considerations of death.

Moreover, iwi reflected the uniqueness of the deceased through the perpetuation of that person's spirit. Pukui asserts that the "unihipili spirit was not an obscure, faceless mystical presence, but the spirit of the named and known person" (Ibid, 108). This may be one site to consider where the body and sentient life philosophize as is Vatter's recommendation.

Life and death, growth and decay are, for Esposito "precisely what makes the body the liminal zone where the immunitary intention of politics is carried out, namely, to delay the passage from life to death as long as possible, to drive death to the farthest point from the presentness of life" (Esposito in Reader, 318). But, if in death life remains, how might that orient our politics differently? Esposito refers to the body as what must be kept alive, it is the "frontline, both symbolic and material, in life's battle against death" (Ibid). The character, the spirit, and the consciousness of the deceased is immortalized in iwi and mana and is also considered in its connection to a 'living' ancestral past and the 'potential' of future generations. In this way, iwi as the "material substance" of the body is not "doomed to rapid decomposition" as weighs so heavily in Esposito's reckoning. I am not suggesting that life was not a privileged place of political intention, rather I assert that the way in which politics was conducted as well as the foci of a politics of life, is oriented differently within 'ōiwi society due to these divergent perceptions of life, death and the body. Esposito may agree with this assessment, he holds that "Only the body is able to fill in the gap that two thousand years of law, theology, and philosophy carved out between things and persons, placing one at the disposition of the other" (Esposito 2015, 123). Reformulating the body, and more importantly the divide between the animate person and the inanimate thing "where they

not only interact but actually complement each other” as mana and iwi do in ‘ōiwi conceptions may be one way in which Esposito’s struggle for an affirmative biopolitics could be manifested (Ibid, 2).

Another move toward an affirmative biopolitics can be located in reassessing and ultimately reconstituting animality within human life. The divide between animal and human found in Western religious and philosophical traditions enables humans to attain eternal life (and bios) only once they are stripped of their animality, a notion that has bled into political thought and action. The problem here is two fold. First, one result of this divide has been to categorize some humans as humans and some humans as animals in order to assert dominance over those human animals and the environments in which they live. For when “humankind defines itself against its animality or denies its animality a productive role, forms of political life emerge based on domination and exploitation of humans by humans” (Lemm 2009, 5). Further, the divide between animal and humans plays out between species, resulting in the dominance of humans over the natural environment, a distance necessary from a Western Christian perspective in order to achieve enlightenment, civilization, and a univocity with God. Moreover, as Wolfe points out, “the practices of modern biopolitics have forged themselves in the common subjection and management of both human and animal bodies—a fact brought very sharply into focus in scholarship that examines the analogies between the technological manipulation of life in the factory farm and in the Nazi camps” (Wolfe 2013, 45).

The paragon in biopolitical scholarship of this separation of human and animal assessed in interhuman relations is found in the Nazi treatment of Jews, Gypsies, and any threat to the healthy, human, and good Aryan population and body politic. Agamben

writes that the modern anthropological machine produces “the Jew, that is, the non-man produced within the man” through the process of “animalizing the human, by isolating the nonhuman within the human” (Agamben 2004, 37). African Studies and English scholar Alexander Weheliye observes the making and portrayal of the Muselmanner “a class or caste of Nazi concentration camp detainees” as “animallike, not-quite human...the potential future fate that awaited the still functional inmates in an already utterly dehumanized space” (2014, 54). The Muselman represents the absolute negative declension of biopolitics, its shift into thanatopolitics, a politics of death, predicated on making some men animals in order to assert the humanness—and thus the right to authority and power—of others. Although for Agamben the Nazi camp is both the culminating point and an aberration of modernity representing the state of exception in Western political practice, Weheliye argues for a recognition of its conditioning in the making of human animals outside a European continental perspective, thus its lack of exceptionality. Instead, he contends the German camps were “the product of colonial provenance...Concentration camps shared an intimate history with different forms of colonialism and genocide before being transformed into the death camps of Nazi Germany” (2014, 35). Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose proffer a similar argument, “we agree that Holocaust is not an exceptional moment of throwback to a singular barbarianism, but an enduring possibility intrinsic to the very project of civilization and the law” (2006, 200). To be sure, Lemm in her analysis of Nietzsche’s animal philosophy argues that civilization means the “emergence of forms of social and political organization...based on the disciplining and taming of the human being’s animality” (Lemm 2009, 154). The preparatory conditioning of the Nazi camp was predicated on

African slavery, indigenous genocide, and indentured servitude that made animals out of the black and brown humans European's (and later American's) colonized, stripping these human animals of their bios and leaving only bare life. A similar—though nowhere near as extensive—process of animalization to obtain religious dominance and eventually political supremacy can be read in examples of missionary discourse of 'ōiwi.

Upon his arrival to Hawai'i with the second company of missionaries sent from Boston, Charles Stewart observed 'ōiwi as wretched creatures, wild, naked, and unintelligible, with the appearance of being half-man and half-beast (1828, 64). He asked, "Can they be men—can they be women?—do they not form a link in creation, connecting man with the brute?" (Ibid). As the ship the *Thames* made its way around the islands, Stewart observed hale (house) referring to them as huts like the "sties and kennels of pigs and dogs" rather than suitable "abodes of men" (Ibid, 65). Stewart's first instinct was to animalize the 'ōiwi that greeted his company and his journal expresses the commonality in this assumption amongst his brethren, he was not alone in his assessment of 'ōiwi as animals and thus less than human. Stewart's immediate reaction reflects the fundamental perspectives shared by missionaries emphasizing Christian teachings that proselytized civilization, enlightenment, and the word of God, the same teachings that foreground the transformation of the terms *pō* and *ao*. He effectively animalized 'ōiwi physically, intellectually, and spiritually. There are manifold issues associated with the animalization of 'ōiwi by Stewart and other missionaries that are underscored by two lines of thought, who has the privilege of being considered human and how that humanness is imagined in relation to other humans and to animals. Walter Mignolo in assessing the Jamaican writer and cultural theorist Sylvia Wynter's work writes,

The problem of the Human is thus not identity-based per se but in the enunciations of what it means to be Human—enunciations that are concocted and circulated by those who most convincingly (and powerfully) imagine the “right” or “moral” characteristics of Human and in this project their own image-experience of the Human into the sphere of Universal Humanness. The Human is therefore the product of a particular epistemology, yet it appears to be (and is accepted as) a naturally independent entity existing in the world (Mignolo 2015, 108).

Indeed, the projected notions of a civilized and Christianized human are inherent to Stewart’s assessment of the ‘ōiwi he first encounters marking their inaccessibility to ola hou or eternal life due to their wild countenance, assumed immorality, and lack of intelligible speech. Yet, an expanded notion of that Christianized and civilized human is fundamental to an ‘ōiwi philosophy of life as a product of ‘ōiwi epistemologies and ontology that asserts an affirmative biopolitics rather than one turned toward death. This life affirming politics and relation to power is enunciated in a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau that displaces the human/animal divide “so prominent in Western self-understandings” of what it means to be human in favor of incorporating the many bodily forms and attributes present in our genealogies (Goldberg-Hiller and Silva 2011, 431). Mignolo concludes his essay on the work of Sylvia Wynter by expressing a similar idea. He contends that Wynter’s works toward a new definition of human by, “thinking through that which we have inherited from Europe, the possibilities and limitations of purely Western science and knowledge systems, and how humanness can be recognized as connective and interhuman” (Mignolo 2015, 122).

Jonathan Goldberg-Hiller and Noenoe Silva write that “Subordination to Christianity and the law played up to the Enlightenment promise of absorbing and diverting savage impulses” repressing the savage and animal aspects embedded in ‘ōiwi

cultural traditions (2011, 432). Their work has provided an inroad into reestablishing a connection between human and animal life as well as possibilities for greater interhuman connection based on ‘ōiwi cosmologies briefly touched upon in the beginning of the chapter. It is through this reestablishment that an affirmative biopolitics may be found. As has been stated throughout the dissertation thus far, mo‘okū‘auhau and in particular the Kumulipo, is an expression of a philosophy of life that proclaims the interrelatedness of living beings as family members. This is inclusive of elements, plants, animals, land, sea, sky, and humans and a “distinction between animal and human is clearly drawn nowhere in this cosmology” (Ibid, 436). Through a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau a differentiation between humans and animals is ambiguous on one hand because of the familial connection but on the other due to the ability of some humans to take animal (and plant etc.) forms, often after death crossing the boundaries between the eternal realm of pō and the realm of earthly existence, ao. Goldberg-Hiller and Silva emphasize this ability as it relates to forming and expanding notions of sovereignty against colonial and state centered violence as a response to Agamben’s concerns regarding the modern anthropological machine. Yet, these expanding notions are only made possible if we consider all forms of life in the scope of political activity and relations to power, a consideration embedded in my interpretation of a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau.

Goldberg-Hiller and Silva incorporate an analysis of ‘aumākua (ancestral deities) in an effort toward a “theoretical escape from neocolonial legality” in regard to an expansion of relations of power within a colonial (or neocolonial) context of contemporary Hawai‘i. ‘Aumākua as a cultural concept and tradition blurs the line between humans and animals and is based on a foundation of genealogy. They also

inform ‘ōiwi understandings of pō and eternal life as these ancestral deities have already passed on into the eternal realm of pō and were often referred to as “po‘e o ka pō, people in the night or dark” (Pukui et al 1972, 36). Pukui further asserts that ‘aumākua are “gods and relatives in one, they give us strength when we are weak, warning when danger threatens, guidance in our bewilderment, inspiration in our arts” (Ibid, 35).

‘Aumākua are the deified ancestors of humans who are transformed through a ceremony called, kākū ‘ai. Pukui holds that “Traditionally, Hawaiians could transform a deceased member of the family into a special class of aumākua (sic)...A relative so transfigured became a particular type of spirit who served family aumākua (sic)” (Ibid, 37). These deified ancestors could take many forms or bodies referred to in Hawaiian as kino lau. The kino lau embodied by deceased human ancestors included sharks, owls, eels, caterpillars, rocks and many other nonhuman forms revealing “alternate insights into the relationship of nonhuman life (what Agamben might dismissively call “bare life”) to qualified political and legal life” thus stretching the Western configuration of bios beyond its synonymity with Western man (Goldberg-Hiller and Silva 2011, 436). The pivot toward an affirmative biopolitics through both the reanimalization of ‘man’ and a recognized interrelatedness between species is illuminated, I argue, in mo‘okū‘auhau as it draws these aspects together. Imagining sharks, for example, as ancestral deities requires the inclusion of other knowledge systems formulated outside of Western conceptions of life and eternal life—both human and animal—that can conceive the act of “swimming with sharks [is] an act of sovereign understanding, drawing on indigenous knowledge, translated through the water in calm, swimming strokes” (Ibid, 439).

Chapter 3

Ho‘oulu Lāhui: Sex, Procreation and Production

The first two chapters of this dissertation introduced the theoretical potential in a convergence of mo‘okū‘auhau and biopolitics in drawing out the relation between life and politics manifested in a complex nineteenth century Hawaiian Kingdom. As argued in these earlier chapters, within political contexts mo‘okū‘auhau has biopolitical tendencies functioning both similarly and in contrast to the ways in which contemporary scholars have formulated expressions primarily associated with Euro-American experiences. These analyses have struggled with the divide between a thanatopolitical declension and an affirmative biopolitics, a politics toward death or one that is life affirming. This tension within biopolitical discourse, and its locus in Europe, in regard to political and sovereign control over life has provided space for certain critiques. Criticism has brought to light some of the constraints of an articulation of humanity “as synonymous with western Man” addressed in Chapter two (Weheliye 2014, 5). This perspective argues for “supplying the analytic tools for thinking the deeply gendered and sexualized provenances of racializing assemblages” as significant tools to disrupt and creatively expand biopolitical analyses outside its application to Euro-American contexts while also calling attention to their genesis in the struggles of colonialism and imperialism, the biological “othering” so to speak of much of the rest of the world committed by European powers (Ibid). In *Society Must Be Defended*, Foucault writes that “no other state could have more disciplinary power than the Nazi regime. Nor was there any other State in which the biological was so tightly, so insistently, regulated” (Foucault 2003, 59). In response, Alexander Weheliye cautions,

We should remain vigilant about not acquiescing to these monumentalizing protocols (and Agamben's) because, more often than not, they achieve their aggrandizing effect by not taking into account the historical relationality and conceptual contiguity between Nazi racism and the other forms of biopolitics... those perfected in colonialism, indigenous genocide, racialized indentured servitude, and racial slavery, for instance (Weheliye, 2013, 59).

Weheliye asks, "Why not simply examine the biopolitics of Nazi racism qua Nazi racism? Why must this form of racism necessarily figure as the apex in the telos of modern racializing assemblages? (Ibid) Although much of Esposito's scholarship is focused on the problem of totalitarianism and Nazi racism, he also acknowledges a Western problematic that resides in "its recurring temptation to make the world over into one model" a mirror of itself, which may be both the answer to Weheliye's question and the basis for universalizing the concept of humanity (Esposito 2013a, 64). In line with Weheliye's concerns that biopolitical discourse both neglects the historical foundations of colonialism and indigenous genocide that made way for modern biopolitical problems like the Nazi regime and is formulated based on notions of humanity embedded in a concept of Western man, this chapter works toward broadening the application of biopower and is focused on 'ōiwi expressions in relation to Kalākaua's political slogan, Ho'oulu Lāhui, in an effort to creatively expand biopolitical analyses. I also take up Esposito's critique of Western political monotheism and its need to make the world over as a reflection of itself as a means to express the sovereign spaces carved out by 'ōiwi formulations of biopower. Esposito writes, "Ever since Heraclitus, the idea that we may be joined together not by what we share but by distinction and diversity is part of Western tradition, but it's an idea that was never achieved" (Ibid). The inclusion of diverse perspectives, religious traditions, governmental structures, and so on is the context in which Kalākaua's reign exists, an inclusion based both on 'ōiwi inclinations

and colonial/imperial intent. However, it is through an appreciation for multiplicity that the Hawaiian Kingdom is able to manifest as a modern nineteenth century nation-state and a ‘ōiwi aupuni. In this line of thinking, the chapter is also an effort to highlight the potential of a life affirming politics present in mo‘okū‘auhau, an affirmative biopolitics made possible, I argue, by the conditions of a political polytheism so to speak.

Ultimately, the manner in which expressions of biopower unfold in Kalākaua’s reign underscore the differences between regimes of power and their relations to the populations they govern.

Chapter two asserted the idea that the life of the lāhui was embodied in Kalākaua through his mo‘okū‘auhau. This chapter takes that argument as its basis and analyzes the ways in which Kalākaua deployed what may be considered an ‘ōiwi version of biopower through relational aspects of mo‘okū‘auhau in order to increase the nation. Biopower describes relations of power “articulated upon the body of the population with the intention of fostering particular attributes” (Campbell 2013, 26). In this chapter I consider sex, procreation and production (cultural and capitalist) to explore biopower in the context of Kalākaua’s political slogan, Ho‘oulu Lāhui, to investigate relations of power and articulations upon the lāhui that encouraged its proliferation. Just as identifying biopower is “not a value-free activity that follows a universal logic of research,” there is no singular or definitive mode in which meaning can be derived from mo‘okū‘auhau (Lemke 2011, 2). Moreover, the overarching goal of this dissertation is to work toward establishing mo‘okū‘auhau as a larger framework in which many applications and methods operate. As an intellectual construction imbricating knowledge, culture, and politics, mo‘okū‘auhau engenders the conceptual structure of

Kalākaua's political slogan, Ho'oulu Lāhui. Within this framework we find the expressions of Kalākaua's leadership in ways that coalesce with theories of biopower oriented to Euro-American contexts made visible through the deployment of his slogan that places sex, procreation, and production at its foundation in order to support and proliferate life in its many forms.

In biopolitical analyses the source of power regulating, disciplining, and ultimately controlling populations is portrayed as an abstract entity, disconnected from the citizenry although its mechanisms are designed to infiltrate and take hold of the life of the population. Kalākaua represented a different type of ruler. He is the sovereign, recognizable in Western conceptions, but he is also the ali'i nui and that relationship is genealogical and bears specific kuleana, an intertwined mo'okū'auhau between himself and his lāhui. Moreover, in following the assertions of the previous chapter, his mo'okū'auhau is the embodiment of the lāhui further connecting his life to the life of the population. The following 'ōlelo no'eau draws the connection between ali'i and lāhui as embedded in cultural practice further, "I ali'i no [nō] ke ali'i i ke kānaka [A chief is a chief because of the people who serve him]" (Pukui 1983, 125). It is in the concepts and relationships that are inherent to the meaning of lāhui and distinguished in a genealogical relationship with the ali'i nui, that significantly differentiates expressions of biopower in Hawai'i from forms expressed elsewhere. Kalākaua's sovereign authority is embodied in these concepts and relationships in ways both inclusive of and exterior to the dictates of Western juridical and philosophical conceptions. I turn here to a description of lāhui by Leilani Basham,

"Lāhui" is just such a word that should not be conceived of as having multiple meanings, but rather as having a

meaning that encompasses and includes concepts that require multiple words in English and have different meanings such as “nation” and “race.” It seems to me that when the author in a Hawaiian context, writing in Hawaiian chose to use the word “lāhui,” he/she did not mean “the nation” or “the race” or “the people.” Rather, when he/she used the word “lāhui,” they actually meant “lāhui,” which includes the “nation,” “race,” and “people.”

Lāhui, therefore is not the general citizenry, it is not only those that have a Hawaiian national identity. It is a specific group within the broader 19th century Hawaiian population, and in that specificity exists the genealogical connections between the mō‘ī and his lāhui. Kalākaua’s proclamation to ho‘oulu lāhui is directed at the lāhui, not the population as a whole. The particulars of lāhui increase when the term is coupled with ho‘oulu. Ho‘oulu means to increase or to grow, as does the word ulu without the causative prefix (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 368). The addition of the ho‘o suggests that there is a consciousness to this growth, an active, thought out direction that goes beyond just the physical act of producing children. Along with the birth of new generations, a cultural, intellectual, and political fostering of those children as members of the lāhui is integral to the growth of the lāhui as a whole. The lāhui is the foundation of the mō‘ī’s leadership and the familial relationship between the two is bound by particular responsibilities that runs through the hierarchy of society. Despite the higher ranking of the mō‘ī they arise from the maka‘āinana. The prestige and success of the mō‘ī is reflected in the success of the lāhui in common, just as the life of the lāhui is embodied in the mō‘ī and in mo‘okū‘auhau. As such, it is not a haphazard or arbitrary growth that is intended by Kalākaua’s insistence that the population ho‘oulu lāhui, or even by his brand of biopower rather, it is deliberate and purposeful. Moreover, the connection is

undoubtedly sexual, as sex and procreation build mo‘okū‘auhau. In Foucault’s *History of Sexuality* Volume 1 sex is a key element but not, according to Deutscher, in the “prevailing biopolitical literature, as the critical means of power’s access to life. Agamben, Esposito and Rose for example, have not favored the argument that the means of access to the life of the body and the species has been primarily through sex” (Deutscher 2012, 121). In ‘ōiwi theories of power and leadership based in mo‘okū‘auhau, sex and procreation are essential, not a sub-domain nor repressive.

Beyond sex however, the slogan encourages the growth of the lāhui in myriad ways. Noelani Arista introduces a method of historical thinking and practice that she terms *kaona* consciousness that illuminates the meanings associated with Kalākaua’s slogan beyond its relation to sex. Arista describes this method as an ‘ōiwi aesthetic of polysemy in which multiplicities of meanings made between varying categories of information are constructed and understood (Arista 2010, 7). Through this method ho‘oulu lāhui, is, on one level, about increasing the population through sex and birth, but it is also suggestive of the cultural, political, and intellectual growth necessary for sustaining a thriving population. Ensuring the health of the population even if through regulation is an act to ho‘oulu lāhui. Supporting and strengthening international relationships that benefit the population, is an act to ho‘oulu lāhui. Perpetuating and bringing to the public fore cultural and nationalist expressions is an act to ho‘oulu lāhui. Moreover, ho‘oulu also means to inspire (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 368). The slogan urges the lāhui to be inspired by the past, present, and future and to in turn ho‘oulu the next generations. Understanding the depth of the slogan requires recognition of its interrelated meanings set forth in mo‘okū‘auhau.

Ho‘oulu Lāhui, Sex and Disease

Ho‘oulu Lāhui set a foundation for the principles of Kalākaua’s rule necessitated at its basic level by the persistent decline of the ‘ōiwi population. This decline began with the arrival of foreigners in 1778 and continued with the spread of introduced diseases throughout the 19th century. Increasing the population of the nation became a rallying point among the ali‘i and during Kalākaua’s reign the push to ho‘oulu lāhui was overtly connected to procreation. The diseases brought to Hawai‘i by foreigners were many—smallpox, bubonic plague, and, leprosy,¹⁴ to name a few—all of which drastically reduced the ‘ōiwi population. Yet, the diseases carried by the sailors on Captain Cook’s Resolution were primarily venereal, as were those carried by merchants and whalers after Cook’s voyage, resulting in long lasting effects on the sexual health of the lāhui, which had a crippling effect on fertility and birth rates. In the early nineteenth century Hawai‘i gained a reputation as the brothel of the Pacific due to the regular sexual exchanges between ‘ōiwi women and foreign sailors. ‘Ōiwi cultural attitudes and mores in regard to sex conflicted with the rigid Christian foundations that shaped sexual perspectives in the United States and Great Britain where many sailors and merchants (and missionaries) hailed. So far reaching was the problem of prostitution and its effect on the ‘ōiwi population that by 1855, it was codified in kingdom law as an “evil practice...calculated to spread disease and death among the people, thereby contributing to their rapid decrease in number (Laws 1855, 12). The departure point of ho‘oulu lāhui was ensuring the basic health and wellbeing of the population through the institution of laws intended to protect it. Encouraging procreation was the next step in increasing the lāhui. However, the

¹⁴ An analysis of leprosy is a significant area for future study as it brings together both ‘ōiwi and Western modes of biopower alongside struggles over colonialism and the health and wellbeing of the lāhui.

intention of the slogan should be grasped in multifaceted contexts that push beyond simply sustaining the population, to include the intellectual, economic, cultural, and political growth that encouraged the lāhui to thrive.

As early as 1827 laws as proclamations began controlling both foreign and ‘ōiwi sexual behavior (Kuykendall 1965, 126). Beamer notes that “Ali‘i understood that law was a means to control foreigners and to protect ali‘i authority within their dominions...ali‘i who used law governed those within their territory, regardless of race, class, or genealogy” (Beamer 2014, 107). One such law, enacted under Ka‘ahumanu’s tenure as kuhina nui (regent) during the reign of Kamehameha III, enforced the monogamous sexual relations between husbands and wives, a marked shift from earlier practices that allowed for multiple partners in sexual relationships (Ibid, 114). The cultural attitude toward sex in ‘ōiwi traditions was acutely different from those brought by Christian missionaries in 1820 and certainly ranged from the sexual mores of the Victorian society and the “imperial prude” Foucault explores. Sex was everywhere in the ‘ōiwi landscape—physically, aesthetically, spiritually, and intellectually. It was expressed in mele, oli, mo‘olelo, and is fundamental to mo‘okū‘auhau. The Kumulipo describes the origin of the cosmos as being produced through the sexuality of elements. Life is brought into being through the sexual energies of plants, animals, fish and birds before humans begin reproducing. Lucia and Mahina Jensen recount the patrons of lovemaking as three wind elements. They write,

“Ma-kani-ke-oe—makani not only meaning wind and breeze, but here referring to a ‘general atmospheric state,’ a perfect analogy of the chemistry existing between two people who are ma‘i kola {sexually aroused}. Into this fiery scenario, the oe defines the friction of two bodies coming together. Lau-ka-pa-lili—kapalili meaning, ‘palpitating as in joy; trembling, throbbing, as the quivering of a leaf {lau} in the wind.’ Hono-a-lele—hono means ‘joining together,’ also ‘a place

where the wind meets a obstruction and is reflected back’ Lele is the bursting forth process by which the wind, a metaphor for passion, is received and returned” (Jensen & Jensen 2005, 132-3).

Attributing procreative power to the animate and inanimate life that makes possible human existence indicates the inclusive and naturalized perspectives ‘ōiwi had in regard to the activity.

Sex was celebrated in ‘ōiwi cultural traditions and was “interwoven in the fabric of daily life” and “accepted without shame...as being both creative and one of the supreme pleasures” (Pukui et. al. 1972, 75). Genitals were cared for in youth by kūpuna to ensure both proper function and pleasure once a child reached maturity. Genital songs or mele ma‘i were composed to extol the prowess of an individual often giving name to their genitals as a sign of respect. Kalākaua and his sister Lili‘uokalani both had mele ma‘i in which their genitals were named, “Queen Lili‘uokalani’s mele ma‘i tells of ‘anapau, frisky or frolicking genitals that went up and down. King Kalākaua’s mele ma‘i credits the king with hālala (very big sexual equipment)” (Ibid, 85). Mele ma‘i function as a site in which both procreation and pleasure manifest to ho‘oulu lāhui, increase the nation by encouraging sex, pleasure, and cultural expression.

In contrast to Christian regulations, ‘ōiwi control of sexual practice was regulated in accordance with cultural traditions embedded in mo‘okū‘auhau. Practices such as punalua discussed in Chapter 2, speak to familial relationships that evoke the expansiveness of mo‘okū‘auhau. However, who one slept with was often based on rank, particularly for ali‘i. One aspect of the regulatory process in ‘ōiwi sexual behavior was centered on kapu, “it was one thing to know about sex and its pleasures, another to remain within the confines of social and moral etiquette, for all instructions were controlled by

the degree of rank possessed by an Ali‘i, regardless of gender” (Jensen & Jensen 2005, 133). Being both sexual and sensual “manifested in the ability to experience unrestrained desire...[and] was as important as having sex simply to procreate a refined lineage” (Ibid, 131).

Sex education started early within the family under the purview of kūpuna (Ibid, 132). Pukui notes that exploratory sex play in childhood “was noted but without horror or alarm” (Pukui et. al. 1978, 76). Moreover, she explains, children were aware of life processes as they observed them in nature making sexual matters “open and above-board; little tension surrounded sex” (Ibid, 79). Although much more open about sex than missionaries, ‘ōiwi instituted certain rules in regard to intercourse. Sex prior to puberty was not allowed, as it went against nature (Ibid). If the child was an ali‘i they were trained by an older ali‘i. Boys learned “timing—how to please the woman. If pregnancy resulted the chiefess kept the baby (Ibid). Girls learned how to “touch and caress a man and make him happy. She was trained to know and control her own body. How to use the muscles that go into rhythmic contractions during intercourse” (Ibid). Once training had concluded, with the exception of the highest-ranking ali‘i “the act of sexual union had no rules. The object was happiness” (Ibid, 85).

Religious conversion in the early 19th century resulted in the decline “of refined eroticism and the terminology that defined it” (Jensen and Jensen 2005, 134). Traditional ‘ōiwi attitudes toward sex coupled with the impact of disease and Christian influence underline the timeliness of Ka‘ahumanu’s proclamations. However, her policies were met with resistance from other ali‘i as well as the foreign population. Some ali‘i went so far as to call for her assassination (Beamer 2014, 114). Sexual restrictions as both a shift

toward the moral foundations of Christianity and an effort to limit the spread of disease within a society that considered sex open and fun are equally plausible. Through these proclamations “the mechanisms of power are addressed to the body, to life, to what causes it to proliferate” (Foucault 1990, 147). Ka‘ahumanu provides an example of one of the “multiple modes in which power operates not primarily through taking, but enhancing life” where “sexuality in particular comes to play a critical role” (Deutscher 2012, 121). Prior to the introduction of foreign diseases, sex was a life enhancing (in all interpretations of the word) activity. With the decline of the population new regulations became necessary to perpetuate and improve life, the critical role sex plays in those restrictions functioned as a method to ho‘oulu lāhui under new circumstances.

The proclamation enacted by Ka‘ahumanu began a 19th century genealogy of regulatory intentions in regard to sex and procreation that erupts in Kalākaua’s administration correlating with his slogan. Early in his reign, Kalākaua urged that special attention be paid not only to increasing the population but also to encouraging the overall health of his ‘ōiwi subjects. In a speech given at Lahaina on April 22, 1874, and printed in the newspaper *Ko Hawaii Pono*, Kalākaua stated his intention to “kukulu hou i ka hale [to rebuild the house of the lāhui]” He refers to survey data collected by “nā papa kuhikuhi helu kanaka [the census board that detailed the demise of the nation]” The English translation pertaining to this section of his speech states, “but will we let the house fall to ruin? If the house is flawed, build it again. Let us cleanse and purify ourselves, then the nation will grow again; the land will thrive and the kingdom, our house, will survive.” From a biopolitical standpoint this elucidates the linkages between “the health of the population and...the economic and political security of the state”

(Nadesan 2008, 94). Kalākaua continued by reviewing and affirming the significance of the mottos of his predecessors. He ends his speech with the following:

Ke manao nei au, ina o ka hooulu lahui kau hana, a laila, e hoolilo au o ka makia ia e paa ai ko kakou aupuni, a pomaikai kakou, a e mau ai ko kakou noho kuokoa ana. No laila, o ka makia o ko‘u aupuni, o ke kanaka a wahine e malama pono a e hoohua nui mai ana i na keiki, o kou kanaka ia. No laila, o ke kauoha ia oukou, e na makua, e malama i ka oukou mau keiki. O oukou hoi, e na keiki, e hoolohe i ko oukou mau makua. O ka hooulu ana i ka lahui, a me ka hooulu ana i na oihana mahi ai, a Me ka oihana kalepa, o na hana nui ia o kou aupuni. Aloha oukou.

I think that if the rejuvenation of the nation is my task, then I will change the motto which will strengthen our kingdom, bless us and perpetuate our independence. Thus the motto of my rule, the man and woman who produce many children, they are my people. Therefore, my command to you, parents, nourish your children. And children, listen to your parents. The increase of the nation, farming and trade are the important tasks of my reign (KHP 1874).

It is not difficult to read the biopolitical tone in these statements from the regulation (through promotion) of sex to its connection to labor, and sovereignty. Sex in this instance is “a regime of power...that develops within institutions and practices that aim to harness the strength and developmental potential of human bodies and put them to use in industrial development” (McWhorter 2004, 40). Kalākaua is not enacting laws overtly encouraging or restricting sexual activities as Ka‘ahumanu did, as those were already codified, but his message is clear—the health of the lāhui as both a population and as a polity is dependent upon procreation. Unpacking the biopolitical possibilities in his statements through procreation shows some of the contrasts and similarities to modern theories of biopower.

Ho‘oulu Lāhui and Production

Foucault argues that sex was silenced and normalized through the “legitimate and procreative couple” (1990, 3). Indeed, Kalākaua’s statements mirror what could be deemed as a Victorian sexuality oriented to marriage, family and reproduction (Deutsher 2012, 122). This reproduction is further connected to labor and economy in his speech and in the trajectory of his reign advancing the mō‘ī’s deployment of ho‘oulu lāhui through political pursuits. In 1875, Kalākaua negotiated a treaty of reciprocity with the United States to support the growing sugar industry, which simultaneously required the development of immigration policies to support the work force needed to sustain a plantation economy. This need for more bodies was due in part to the continued decline of the ‘ōiwi population. The economy however, was not the only reason for immigration. Kalākaua supported immigration with the express intention of reinvigorating ‘ōiwi society through inter-marriage and procreation. A labor force was a significant factor, but so was the health and well being of the lāhui in order to rebuild the “hale” to ensure its independence. A report by the Minister of Foreign Affairs was careful to articulate this need as well as Kalākaua’s reasons for supporting immigration policies. The report states that Kalākaua,

early gave expression to...this important measure...and declared his royal purpose to favor the “increase of the nation”—(Ho‘oulu Lahui)—which has become a national watchword among the Hawaiian people; and how the introduction of new people to mingle with them has been appreciated by the native race

In these policies, Kalākaua envisioned the increase in the nation’s population through inter-mingling (sex) with newly arrived immigrants. Prosperity would further

aid in preserving the ‘ōiwi population by offering the people an incentive to industry, one of the surest means to preserving health and long life, according to the mō‘ī (Lydecker 1918). Here, immunitary language is present in both political speech and policy, wherein the cleansing and purifying of individual bodies and the body represented by the lāhui, works to protect it against future threats of disease. Simultaneously, the influx of immigrants and the encouragement toward industry immunize the lāhui against the continued decline of the population through encouraging inter-marriage and capitalist production. Esposito explains,

We all know that, in biomedical language, immunity names a form of exemption from, or protection against an infectious disease; in the juridical lexicon immunity represents a sort of safeguard that makes someone beyond the common law...Certainly every society has expressed a need to be protected. Every collectivity has posed a fundamental question about how to preserve life (Esposito 2013a, 58-9).

For Kalākaua and the lāhui the immunitary paradigm functioned in reverse from Esposito’s application of it in the West. To immunize the lāhui against the actual microbes causing it harm—diseases affecting fertility, for example—an infusion of new and healthy blood, new and healthy bodies by way of immigration was necessary to ho‘oulu lāhui. Whereas in Euro-American contexts “The fact that the growing flows of immigrants are thought (entirely erroneously) to be one of the worst dangers for our societies” (Ibid, 59).

Foucault argues that “it had long been asserted that a country had to be populated if it hoped to be rich and powerful...that its future and its fortune were tied not only to the number and the uprightness of its citizens...but to the manner in which each individual made use of sex” (1978, 26). In regulating the population through the promotion of

procreation, Kalākaua was fulfilling his desire for “the perpetuity of the Crown and the permanent independence of the government and the people of Hawaii on the basis of equity, liberty, prosperity, progress and protection of the whole people” (Kalākaua 1874). As his reign expanded and solutions to the initial issues of health, economy and pursuing foreign relations progressed, he moved to focusing more attention on increasing the nation in terms of education and technology—supporting a study abroad program and the development of acts to aid in the introduction of electric telegraphs and steam navigation with foreign countries to show that his people were prepared to take advantage of all the improved methods of communication and information sharing that existed at the time. Yet, these were always simultaneous measures, a healthy citizenry was foremost to preserving and perpetuating the welfare of the nation and the message of ho‘oulu lāhui was a constant pronouncement. In a legislative address Kalākaua reaffirms the inherency of his slogan to his leadership and its reach beyond procreation, “...in instructing the people in all that tends to preserve their health and comfort, and to increase their means and their knowledge...each man who takes good care of himself and his family...is adding to the strength of my Kingdom and assisting in the perpetuation of our race” (Lydecker 1918). The benefits of reciprocity were meant to affect more than just economic increases.

By the 1880s, words like loyalty, patriotism, and independence began creeping into the mō‘ī’s speeches. Kalākaua had, since his election, faced dissension from both ‘ōiwi and haole detractors and some of that opposition grew in the 1880s—particularly from his haole subjects. Kalākaua began incorporating phrases such as, “I earnestly appeal to your patriotism...” or “bear with you a warmer love of your country, and a

deeper interest in your nationality and independence...” into his addresses while continuing to appeal to the legislature to support health initiatives, public improvements, immigration policies, national defense, and greater foreign alliances—particularly within Oceania. In his public life he made more overt displays of his authority through ‘ōiwi cultural expressions—publishing the cosmogonic genealogy, Kumulipo, supporting and contributing to the Kingdom’s National Museum items that marked his genealogical connection to the great ali‘i of the past, re-establishing the Hale Nauā, an organization of ali‘i dedicated to the study of genealogy and Hawaiian and Western scientific ideas. These expressions of chiefly authority were ridiculed by his haole detractors as evidence of his inability to function as a modern leader conceived of in reflection to his American or European counterparts. From an ‘ōiwi perspective however, these displays of authority were further expressions of ho‘oulu lāhui and embedded in chiefly responsibilities to the people—he was afterall the leader of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Abad, writes in reference to chiefly activities prior to the establishment of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1810 that, “Ali‘i nui determined and directly or indirectly administered all large-scale activities that occurred within...Hawai‘i. While many hands and minds were involved collectively in Hawaiian religious, economic, social, and political activities, such actions were conceived of, approved by, and/or coordinated by ali‘i.” (Abad, 129) Kalākaua did likewise, perpetuating the traditions of his chiefly ancestors during a period of modernization. He functioned as both a traditional mō‘ī and a modern monarch concerned with increasing his nation beginning with the health of his people, the economic and political viability of his government, and the cultural vitality of his lāhui. In other words, the kaona (veiled references) of his slogan unfurls to highlight the

intellectual, cultural, political and economic increases made during his rule, linked physically to the nation's citizenry, in ways that indicate the kind of leader he both was and aspired to be.

Ho'oulu Lāhui and Ahahui Hooulu a Hoola

The health and well being of the lāhui was one reason Kalākaua encouraged procreation and supported immigration policies. Kalākaua's rise to the throne occurred on February 12, 1874. On February 19, just a short time later, the Ahahui Hooulu a Hoola was established at Kawaiaha'o Church. The first president of the charitable society was Miriam Likelike, one of Kalākaua's younger sisters. The work of the society involved travel to the various districts in the islands aiding the sick and destitute by providing access to health care and financial support. Kalākaua, his wife Kapi'olani, and his sister and heir, Lili'uokalani donated generously to the society. One way Kalākaua fulfilled his kuleana to the lāhui was through his personal and familial support of the society that shared a name with his political slogan. The concept of ho'oulu lāhui and Kalākaua's commitment to it was not abstract but concrete and functioned outside the office of monarch (although not independent of his position as an ali'i).

The Hui Hooulu a Hoola kept records of the ill, monitored various data involving types of illness, money, family members, and locations, and had a strict set of policies that it followed. Section V of the society's bylaws states that once the President was made aware of a case of sickness the organization shall "render such temporary relief as is necessary...and if possible to move such sick person to the Queen's Hospital. The President may also direct some person to watch such sick person" (Daily Bulletin 1888,

6). Section VI of the bylaws requires that all members of the Executive Committee of the organization must follow The Book of Health Rules prepared by Hon. W.M. Gibson (Daily Bulletin 1888, 7). In 1881, Walter Murray Gibson compiled and published under the Direction of the Board of Education, by order of the Legislative Assembly of 1880, a guide titled, Sanitary Instructions for Hawaiians. The guide was published in the Hawaiian language but a few copies were translated into English for “presentation to foreign physicians, heads of sanitary institutions and philanthropic individuals, at home and abroad” (Gibson 1881, iii). The contents of the guide cover a range of topics including, the human body, outdoor cleanliness, venereal disease, care of children, antidotes for poisons, infanticide, prostitution, and women’s diseases (viii). Gibson’s instructional guide belonged to “an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations” (1978, 140). Sex and sexuality was critical to both Gibson’s guide and regulation of the ‘ōiwi population through it. The focus on female reproduction, prostitution, and childrearing within Gibson’s text, typically falls within the domain of female responsibility and these categories are a significant component of his instructions. The guide implores ‘ōiwi to take care of the children, “Aia ka manaolana o ka lahui ma o na keiki [The children are the hope of the future of the race]” (Gibson 1881, xi; xvii). The state of ‘ōiwi women and girls was a focal point for Gibson as there were “three times their number of foreign and native males combined” (Ibid, xviii). Gibson was particularly perturbed by the unmarried men who he viewed as bound to “curse our islands with barrenness” (Ibid). The section of the guide expressing frustration with unmarried men of both ‘ōiwi and foreign origin is followed by a section admonishing polyandry. Gibson writes,

He mea keia e inoino loa ai ka noho ana o na kanaka, e poi ana hoi ka malamalama o ka lahui kahi i maa i na kane he lehulehu e noho pu ana ma ke ano he kane a wahine, me ka wahine hookahi. Aole no e hiki elua makuakane no ke keiki hookahi; nolaila, ina o ka wahine mare e moe aku ana me ka lua o ke kane, he mea ia e huole ai kona puao. Ina paha elua a ekolu kane a ka wahine hookah, o ka pau no ia o na manaolana e loa ai ke keiki a oukou; e na Hawaii, ke makemake oukou e hooulu i ka lahui, alaila, e kapae ae i ka huaolelo punalua, oia ka inoa i kapaia ai ka lua o ke kane a ka wahine hookahi. E hoomanao a e malama oukou, ma ka helu akahi i ka ohana.

This is the ruin of society; and civilization cannot flourish, where it shall become a recognized custom that many men may cohabit as acknowledged partners with one woman. Two men cannot be conjointly the father of a child; therefore the second man who has intercourse with a woman, already married, serves only to promote hurtful excitement and sterility of the womb. A second or third husband, or rather partner in a woman's embraces, destroys hopes of offspring, and you, Hawaiians, hoping for the increase of your nation, should learn to banish the word punalua, your name for the third member of a conjugal or sexual union from your language. You should cherish above all things the institution of the family (Ibid, xii-iii; xix).

Despite over sixty years of Christian influence and ali'i proclamations and laws, 'öiwi sexual customs were still practiced. The same arguments regarding sex, familial relationships, and the spread of disease promoted by missionaries and ali'i in the 1820s are read here in Gibson's guide of 1881. The maintenance of traditional sexual and familial relationships may have been a way to push back against the domination of Christian morality, to instead suggest that punalua is not a remnant of a heathen past, but a form of sovereign expression against Christian and haole desire for political and cultural supremacy. Thomas Lemke writes that, "Sexuality represents a bodily behavior that gives rise to normative expectations and is open to measures of surveillance and discipline" (2011, 38). Gibson's insistence on restraining sexual practices and his hope for an English reading audience acts as a measure of surveillance of the 'öiwi population—and in particular its women—performed by Euro-American physicians,

heads of sanitary institutions, and philanthropic individuals, who make up the “expert authorities acting within public and private institutions” responsible for cataloguing and compiling data necessary for expressing biopower (Nadesan 2008, 8). Lemke argues that the privileged position sexuality takes is due to reproduction and the biological processes of population. Therefore, it functions at both “the microlevel of the body and the macrolevel of a population” making it a key site of intervention (Lemke 2011, 38).

Reconsidering the Hui Hooulu a Hoola and its use of Gibson’s health related materials, its record keeping, and its connection to the monarch, did this charitable organization function as an institution regulating the population, its sexuality, and its reproduction for the purposes of labor? The society did record data regarding the health of the population, it did have members who were experts and compiling data, and it was a charitable organization functioning in the public realm. But, there is also something curious about the society’s concerns expressed in its by-laws that start a conversation regarding contrasts between expressions of biopower in Kalākaua’s regime and in the Western world Foucault and other scholars have analyzed. This provides an initial intervention into what Kalākaua’s his leadership can tell us about biopower, not in the West necessarily, but here as it functioned during his reign. I turn again to the organization’s bylaws, Section XI,

If the sick person is destitute, and has no one to take care of him, and is poor, and has not relatives or friends, but, has an aikane who is supporting him, and who has more love for him than his own relations, then such a person is not entitled to assistance from this Society (8).

What stands out in this section is the term aikane.¹⁵ What is an aikane? It is not a friend or a relative as the Ahahui makes clear. It is someone outside of those relationship categories with the capacity to love and care for the sick person more than a friend or family member. An aikane also occupies a position within a relationship that the Ahahui either chose not to or could not translate into English. The gender orientation in the Society's description of the sick person is male, whether that is fixed or neutral according to the time period is unclear—but in my analysis it does have bearing. Here too may be another area in which expressions of sovereignty against dominant Christian morality and colonial encroachment are exposed.

According to Pukui and Elbert an aikane can be defined as a friend; friendly; to become a friend, or to commit sodomy although they mark that definition as rare (1986, 10). Noenoe Silva also defines the term aikāne. In the glossary section of her book *Aloha Betrayed*, Silva gives the meaning as, friend, also lover of the same sex (2004, 237). In the text of her book Silva recounts an article published in the Hawaiian language newspaper *Ka Hae* about Kaomi a “well-known aikāne” who was of Tahitian and ‘ōiwi descent but more importantly was “a male lover of Kauikeaouli” loathed by the missionary establishment (Ibid, 61).

Understanding aikane in the society's bylaws to be a homosexual lover, calls into question the notion that the Ahahui Hooulu a Hoola functioned as a regulatory institution concerned with the reproduction of the population representing a biopolitical regime that expressed its power in the same manner that Foucault and other scholars have articulated in regard to Europe and the U.S. In regimes of biopower “homosexuality, masturbation,

¹⁵ In this instance I do not include the diacritical marking because it is not in the original Ahahui text.

and the hysterical woman—are rendered problematic not just because they offend the declared norm but also because of their non-conformity with the requirements of a disciplined, channeled and non-squanderous reproductive sexuality” (Deutscher 2012, 122). The homosexual aikāne epitomizes degeneracy in the Western disciplined and regulated society. An aikāne would not procreate and contribute to a growing work force thus supporting the capitalist society.¹⁶ Moreover, in Western conceptions an aikāne would have, according to the experts, “followed a deviant developmental path” so “it was important to make sure they did not reproduce themselves and thereby introduce more degenerates into the population” (McWhorter 2004, 45). The next part of Section XI of the Society’s bylaws states, “But if such a person has no one to care for him, then the Society shall give him temporary assistance and endeavor to induce him to go to the hospital or to the Lunalilo Home” (1888, 8). In 19th century Hawaiian society, the deviant aikāne would have been cared for by this charitable organization regardless of his perceived degeneracy.

Conclusion

“Politics plays a dirty trick on life—while wanting to protect it, it can end up destroying it” (Neyrat 2010, 32). This is the aporia of biopolitics understood through the language of immunity, a drift toward a politics of death, a politics that is bent on protecting some “by eliminating everything that might work against it. It is an absolute perversion of the terms of politics” (Ibid, 33). Kalākaua’s encouragement to ho‘oulu lāhui serves the opposite purpose. Instead, by taking hold of life, starting with sex and

¹⁶ I am explicitly referring to homosexual not bisexual *aikāne*.

procreation, the intention and direction of power works to enhance life. Furthermore, he acted as his predecessors did, by attempting to vaccinate the lāhui against the political domination of colonialism, imperialism, and Christian morality. Like medical vaccinations, Kalākaua and the ali‘i of the Kingdom period allowed “tolerable portions” of foreign influence as a measure of protection against all out takeover (Esposito 2013a, 61).¹⁷ The push to ho‘oulu lāhui likewise added protection to the continued life of the lāhui. Moreover, the focus on the protection of the lāhui as an ‘ōiwi body politic, rather than eliminating everything and everyone that works against it in order to protect and perpetuate itself, all lives are enhanced. The methods, the terms, and even the format of Kalākaua’s expression of biopower is strikingly similar to the modes in which life is grasped in Euro-American contexts. Yet, the framework of mo‘okū‘auhau or mo‘okū‘auhau as a philosophy of life that highlights the interrelation between the mō‘ī and his lāhui works to promote an affirmative biopolitics rather than a turn toward thanatopolitics. I turn back to Esposito and his term “Political monotheism” by which he means “the idea that one king and one kingdom must correspond to one God” (Ibid, 63). Esposito argues in regard to the events of September 11, 2001,

Everything happened, everything was bound to and then was let loose, within the vicious cycle of monotheism, and not in the Buddhist or Hindu world. Why? I would say that both Islamic and Christian civilizations, through Judaism, faced off not in terms of how they were different but instead in terms of how they were similar and all joined in their constitutive categories to the logic of the One, which is to say to the syndrome of monotheism...Both mean to unify the world to their own points of view (Ibid, 63).

¹⁷ Takeover does occur in January 1893. However, another important topic for future study is the biopolitics at play during the period leading up to the illegal overthrow. Similar to the issue of leprosy within this frame, the overthrow and the preceding imposition of the Bayonet Constitution, are sites of analysis for ‘ōiwi and *haole* forms of biopower.

The chapter started with the thoughts of Alexander Weheliye and his desire for creative expansion of biopolitics and a reformulation of the universalization of humanity embedded in Western man and a unified view of the world based on a monotheistic perspective. Mo‘okū‘auhau brings together Weheliye’s concerns and Esposito’s critique and provides inroads into this expansion. The protection of the lāhui was embedded in an expanded view of life and the world based within a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau, one that accepted and adapted a monotheistic perspective but that also privileged its polytheistic—or, more simply its dual source foundations. In as much as this chapter is focused on the the perpetuation, protection, and growth of the physical bodies of the lāhui, these concerns are easily transmitted to the growth and protection of ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge. The methods to preserve the physical bodies of the lāhui are similarly used to encourage the growth of ‘ōiwi bodies of knoweldge, which are the focus of the following chapter.

Chapter 4

Ho‘oulu Lāhui: Perpetuating ‘Ōiwi Bodies of Knowledge

In the only book of ‘ōiwi “poetic compositions” published during the Kingdom era, *Na Mele Aimoku*, was presented as a gift to honor Kalākaua upon his fiftieth birthday celebration. Kalākaua was a great patron of traditional arts and the gift is fitting in both the context of his time and in relation to traditional practices as mele were often composed and presented to honor ali‘i. According to Puakea Nogelmeier who wrote the introduction to the republished text, “While each 19th century Hawaiian sovereign acknowledged the importance of traditional mele, it was King Kalākaua who most openly advocated for this legacy of poetic composition performed as chant and hula” (2002, xi). The chants in the publication celebrate Kalākaua as mō‘ī, honor the lāhui, and act as part of the body of knowledge that informed the national narrative of the time. They also exalt his mo‘okū‘ahau and in turn praise the knowledge of his kūpuna and the life of the lāhui.

Both traditionally and during the Kingdom era it was common practice for ali‘i to inherit chants from older ruling chiefs in order to support new regimes through the inherited mana of their predecessors. Many of the mele in Kalākaua’s gifted collection functioned in that manner (Ibid, xii). Moreover, mele are often developed over time and in shifting contexts resulting in their own mo‘okū‘auhau. The innovative chant ‘Au‘a ‘ia, for example, that originated in the Kamehameha tradition, and is also entitled *He Mele Inoa No Aikanaka*, features prominently in *Na Mele Aimoku*, as the first composition. Kalākaua as a descendant of Aikanaka inherited the mele thus drawing connections to his ancestor as well as to Kamehameha. During the contentious election period the mele was referred to in the genealogical debates between J.K. Unauna and S.M. Kamakau as

evidence of Kalākaua's mana passed to him through his mo'okū'auhau and specifically his relation to 'Aikanaka and the mele Au'a 'ia. Unauna wrote, "Aole he mele i hanaia mamua e like me keia; aole no hoi mahope mai a hiki i keia wa" [There has never been a song made like this, nothing since then to now] (KNH 1873, 3). The traditions associated with Kamehameha and especially 'Au'a 'ia, are "an authentically indigenous response to a new age" (Charlot 1985, 5). This new age collided with the Western world and the introduction of new weapons, diseases, and ideas, encounters Kalākaua continued to confront during his rule more than seventy years later. Confrontations with the West coincided with Kamehameha's struggle to unite the political and religious governance of the four separate kingdoms through his position as a pono ali'i. For Kalākaua, the conjoining of his reign through shared mele with other reknowned ali'i, like Kamehameha, worked as a method to build his own political power and maintain a compelling narrative that was expressed across relational genres and functioned within a framework of mo'okū'auhau. In many ways Kalākaua's broad political aspirations often aligned with or perpetuated Kamehameha's. Charlot suggests that Kalākaua's rule appeared to be a continuation of Kamehameha I's, traveling abroad, establishing an Oceanic empire/alliance and making trade agreements with foreign countries were part of both rulers' policies (Charlot 1985, 5). Kamehameha I and Kalākaua embraced foreign tools and incorporated foreign technologies but remained secure in appreciating the value of 'ōiwi ingenuity and the connection to 'āina and lāhui. The mele 'Au'a 'ia underlines the symbolic linkages between both ali'i as it exhorts the need to hold fast to what is most meaningful, the 'āina and thus the people who belong to it, the lāhui. The first four lines are presented below with a translation by John Charlot (2003, 30-31).

E 'au'a 'ia e kama e kona moku
Kona moku e kama e 'au'a 'ia
'O ke kama kama kama i ka hulinu'u
'O ke kama kama kama i ka huliau

O child, hold on to your land
O child, be held by your land
Your land, O child, withhold it
Child, child, child, of the highest, turning heights
Child, child, child, of the changing, searching times

This chapter extends the arguments put forth in Chapter 3 and applies Kalākaua's slogan, ho'oulu lāhui, to the extensive cultural productions manifested during his reign and in conjunction with his mo'okū'auhau, the Kumulipo. The chapter focuses on the work of Ka Papa Kū'auhau o Nā Ali'i Hawai'i (Papa Kū'auhau) referred to in English as the Board of Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs (Board). Increasing the cultural attributes of the lāhui reflects a framework of mo'okū'auhau that operates in much the same way as described in Chapter 2, wherein our conceptions of the past are directly tied to and inclusive of the contributions made by ancestors who lived before us, appended by those living in the present, and built upon by our children in the future. Information flows back and forth in time adding to a system of knowledge, of relationships, and of life. Thus drawing links between Kamehameha I and Kalākaua's leadership, for example, works to express relations of power constructed and perpetuated within a framework of mo'okū'auhau and promoting a specific ideology for political purposes. Moreover, in as much as Kalākaua sought the protection and proliferation of 'ōiwi bodies, he also encouraged the increase of 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge through the cultural and political institutions that he created and the public performances and displays of his leadership. The immunitary function of his endeavors also worked to preserve these bodies of

knowledge in much the same way that the physical bodies of the lāhui were maintained. By deploying ho‘oulu lāhui as a method to protect against the cultural and intellectual violence of Christian influence and colonial intent, Kalākaua immunized an ‘ōiwi system of knowledge against the infectious disease of domination. Taking into account the framing of this system of knowledge as a body (or bodies) also recalls that for Esposito the body is what must be kept alive, it is the “frontline, both symbolic and material, in life’s battle against death” (2015, 318). ‘Ōiwi bodies of knowledge are alive during Kalākaua’s reign, although imperiled by the same issues afflicting the ‘ōiwi physical bodies. Yet, in the same way that the life of ‘ōiwi bodies are maintained, even in death, through mana so too are ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge. Nonetheless, they function as a site of management and reproduction attuned to “the mechanisms of power are addressed to the body, to life, to what causes it to proliferate” (Foucault 1990, 147). ‘Ōiwi bodies of knowledge represent the life of the lāhui.

‘Ōiwi intellectuals of the 19th century utilized their training in oral tradition coupled with their engagement with literacy to produce cultural expressions embedded in both methods of knowledge production. Literacy provided a new model in which to engage knowledge and as we can see through the vast quantities of Hawaiian language newspapers this new model was regularly employed. Indications also abound in regard to an earlier, traditional, appreciation for acquiring and growing ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge.

Thus, the flurry of intellectual activity and interest in Hawaiian history and traditions that can be found in the Hawaiian language newspapers was not simply a nineteenth-century innovation...[but] was a continuation and development of intellectual traditions from times before Hawaiian people’s contact with Euro-Americans and their intellectual traditions (Arista 2007, ix)

However, the 19th century was a time of contact between peoples that influenced culture, politics and knowledge and in the interstices of these engagements there is much to learn about the period of Kalākaua’s rule.

Ka Papa Kū‘auhau o Nā Ali‘i

Oiai, na hoohoikiia ka Papa ma ke kanawai, ma o ke Kuauhau wale no a me na Moolelo; aka, e pili pono ana me keia kumuhana na kumuhana Akeakamai o ka Piliologio (Pili ina mea o ke kino) Pisikolologia (Pili ina manao) Piliologia (Piliiolelo) Paleontologia (Pili i ka wa kahiko) Zoologio (Pili ina holoholona) Botonia (Laau ulu) Orontologio (Pili in a manu) Conokologio (Pili ina Pupu) a me na mea wehewehe Akeakamai ana e pili ana ina mea a pau o keia Pae Aina o Hawaii.

Though the Board is limited by Law to the subject of Genealogy alone, still connected to the subject is the Physiology, Psychology, Philology, Palaeontology, Zoology, Botany, Ornithology, and Choncology, and other scientific subjects pertaining to the Hawaiian Islands, without which the work of the Board would be incomplete.

—Excerpt from Hoike a ka Papa Kuauhau o na Alii Hawaii (Board of Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs), 1884¹⁸

More than 100 years after its submission to the 1884 Hawaiian Kingdom legislature, the content of the Papa Kū‘auhau report provides recourse to a deeper understanding of mo‘okū‘auhau as a broad framework. The intellectual pursuits undertaken by the Papa Kū‘auhau, included the collection of ancient histories consisting of mele, oli, tangible cultural productions, as well as iwi of powerful ali‘i alongside the members’ interests in modern scientific fields of inquiry. Such topics initially seem beyond the purview of the Papa Kū‘auhau’s legislative mandate to compile chiefly genealogies. Though the scope of the Papa Kū‘auhau’s work comprised a variety of topics outside of their official

¹⁸ The excerpts above are taken from the Hawaiian and English versions of the reports submitted to the 1884 Hawaiian Kingdom Legislature.

mandate, the closing remarks made in the report extend this even further. In the observations noted above, the board recognized their inability to conclude their research without greater examination into additional subjects in order to formulate a more complete rendering of their genealogical findings. The multivalent qualities of mo‘okū‘auhau expressed in the work of Papa Kū‘auhau in the late 1800’s, today provides inroads to a complicated repository of ancestral knowledge that organized seemingly disparate components of mele, iwi, and zoology—as some examples—within a system that emphasized their relational aspects. Engaging mo‘okū‘auhau as the nexus between political and cultural expressions, exposes the ontological and epistemological contexts in which our ancestors, like the members of the Papa Kū‘auhau, lived and thrived.

The Papa Kūauhau o Nā Ali‘i Hawai‘i, the Board of Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs, was established by a legislative act in 1880 to research and perpetuate chiefly genealogies. The goal of the Papa Kū‘auhau was to function as a repository from which the future mō‘ī and representatives of the House of Nobles would be selected. Kalākaua appointed the members and selected Queen Kapiolani’s eldest sister, Po‘omaikelani as president.

It was an important aspect of ‘ōiwi tradition that the collected genealogies comprised the history of ali‘i and mō‘ī from ancient times to the reign of Kalākaua, not just the verification of genealogies for living ali‘i (Laws 1880, 17). Accordingly, the Papa Kū‘auhau took its legislative responsibility steps beyond the collection of chiefly genealogies and collected other sources of ancient histories consisting of mele and significant objects of antiquity including the bones of powerful ali‘i. The Papa Kū‘auhau ordered maps of deep-sea soundings to investigate ‘ōiwi origins and extended their

inquest of ali‘i genealogies to that of the human species as a whole suggesting in the 1884 report that this was the natural progression this kind of research should make (KPK 1884, 21). The Papa Kū‘auhau also raised scientific questions regarding the possible existence of two submerged Pacific continents and stated that they could not thoroughly fulfill their mission without further study of scientific subjects like physiology, botany and chonology (Ibid, 22). The scope of this work was extremely broad but with specific political and cultural purposes that underlined the importance of mo‘okū‘auhau as both a framework and a philosophy of life.

Of the entire collection the Papa Kū‘auhau obtained, nothing resonated more with the work they were trying to accomplish than the Kumulipo. “The Mele Kumulipo, owing to its originality is one of the richest acquisitions to the work of the Board. It is evident from this source of information, that the ancient people of these Islands had a cosmogony of their own...in an archaeological sense it is of exceeding interest” (Ibid, 15). Although the Board specifically sites its archaeological interest, the acquisition of the chant and the way it was used to support the objectives of the mō‘ī represented important political and intellectual positions.

The Kumulipo has been analyzed within this dissertation as a framework in which mele, iwi, and cultural objects belonging to the Papa Kū‘auhau’s collections are extrapolations of a larger political and life-affirming project. This larger context functioned in the 19th century informed by both ‘ōiwi and non-‘ōiwi epistemologies. Reading the reports and records of the Papa Kū‘auhau to address the themes of sex, procreation, and production—themes embedded in the mō‘ī’s political slogan of ho‘oulu lāhui— suggests the connections that orally disciplined intellectuals trained in multiple

traditions were making during this time (Arista 2007, ix). The Board considered its collection of mele to be part of the historical record and “took no other guide than that furnished by ancient folklore” to support the various theories it put forth (BOG 1884, 14). There were over 128 compositions listed in the 1884 report that spanned a time frame from ancient, the Kumulipo being the oldest, to modern. Of these mele, many work to validate the mana of the mō‘ī. Although the Kumulipo is the most compelling and detailed composition that worked to assert his mana, the many other mele speak to the long history of his family’s chiefly status. In looking at the way the Papa Kū‘auhau organized the mele from ancient to modern, and categorized them with a separate section for Kaua‘i, presumably in honor of his wife Kapi‘olani’s mo‘okū‘auhau, the mele evoke chiefly mana based on place, family and a connection to the akua. Noticeable connections can also be found to other ali‘i, including the mō‘ī of the Kamehameha dynasty.

Mele was an important format for expressing a range of ideas whose composers based their content in multiple foundations: fertility, land, politics, and the spirit world. In this way the collection of these mele connect Kalākaua to significant places and people further investing his rule with the mana imbued from these aspects. Mele memorialize subjects and perpetuate knowledge while (inherently) also continuing to develop the process of transmitting information. The Papa Kū‘auhau used the Kumulipo to funnel information from the past to engage a broad range of issues in their present, in order to proliferate new knowledge and preserve it for future generations. The importance of perpetuating ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge functioned in relation to the proliferation of ‘ōiwi physical bodies, as measures to sustain a thriving lāhui. Moreover, the “life” embodied

in mele ensured its projection into the future as recourse to an intellectual sovereignty that maintained ‘ōiwi authority over cultural production.

Mele, Mo‘okū‘auhau and Origin Theories

In relation to mele, and in particular the Kumulipo, one of the many issues confronted by the Papa Kū‘auhau dealt with migration and origin theories. “One of the principal aims of the Board...is to endeavor to place within an approximate date the migration to and from these Islands” (Ibid, 14). Using traditional knowledge and “divesting itself of all quotations from other sources” the Board fixed migration patterns from Hawaii to a time long before those given by other historians (Ibid, 14-15). Key components are raised here. First, is the possibility that migrations were instigated from Hawai‘i. This was contrary to theories expressed during that time period that traced settlement patterns to Hawai‘i. The Board’s position and use of mele reinforced the idea that Hawai‘i was an ancient society with high-culture articulations to prove it. Second, the time frame in which these migrations took place established the long presence of ‘ōiwi in the islands.

Using the Kumulipo and the mo‘olelo associated with it, the Board noted the birth of La‘ila‘i in the eighth wā as the first human. There is no definitive time frame for the previous seven wā but in analyzing the chant, the composer(s) made it clear that this was a long process. It is a cosmogonic genealogy and establishing the world did not, from the Hawaiian perspective occur in six days.

Four hundred and fifty generations after La‘ila‘i’s birth the first (e)migration takes place. Uliuli, the wife of Kapolokalili, “leaves the country and travel(s) toward the West” (15). A specific location is not given in either the English or Hawaiian versions of

the report and the record of this (e)migration by the Board says little more beyond designating her as Uliuli Ulu nui melemele o Hakalauaialono, revered as the goddess of agriculture (1884, 15). The second migration occurs at the six hundred and fifty sixth generation. Again, this (e)migration is set in motion by a woman, Halulu the wife of Kepoo. According to the tradition used by the Board, Halulu left from Upolu, Kohala, Hawai‘i and went to Kahikimaieka. When she returned, she brought with her a bird named--Halulu o ka manu kani Halau. The halulu is a type of pelican; the Government Museum at the time had the skeletal remains of one such bird on display (1884, 15). The halulu is also one of the bird gods born in the third wā of the Kumulipo.

O ka leina keia a ka manu o Halulu
 O Kiwa`a, o ka manu kani halau
 O ka manu lele auna a pa`a ka La
 Pa`a ka honua i na keiki manu a ka pohaha
 He au pohaha wale i ka mu-ka

The bird gods Kīwa‘a and Halulu appear in many mo‘olelo and mele that have been maintained. One such mele composed for Ka‘ahumanu by Nī‘auhoe laments the loss of her godly bird body that occurs when she converts to Christianity. The mele, which is actually a kanikau (dirge), references both the godly bird and the Kumulipo illustrating the way in which mele and mo‘okū‘auhau function relationally.

‘O Halulu ‘oe, ‘o ka manu kani hālau
 O kū ‘oe ka haka ‘ēheu o ia manu,
 Kani Kīwa‘a, ka manu i ka wā luna.
 He kino manu, he inoa manu, no ka lani,
 kō inoa ē.

You are Halulu, the bird that calls
 above the longhouses
 You stand on the perch of that bird’s
 outstretched wings
 Kīwa‘a is calling, the prophetic bird
 of the upper spaces
 A bird body, a bird name, from the
 sky, for the chief. Your name
 (Charlot 2001, 395)

Although seemingly nominal, the information gleaned is significant and suggests the associations ‘ōiwi made through a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau. In the Kumulipo manuscript, there is nothing more in the sections about the women Uliuli and Halulu than a list of names:

Line 1160.	Kupolokalili	Uliuli
	Kupolomene	Hiwauli
	Kupolohulu	Kinopu
	Kupolohulilau	Makiao
	Kupolohulimai	Makiaoea
Line 1587	Kepoo	Halulu
	Oliua	Kauikau
	Kikona	Kaimai

History was learned and recalled through the stories that are connected with the names listed in the genealogy. The Board supported its position using knowledge passed down through oral traditions often disseminated through multiple avenues and in parts. The names of the women may have been preserved in the Kumulipo, but their individual stories had a form of their own making it possible to recount their deeds independent of the larger genealogy similar to the mo‘olelo of Papa and Wākea discussed in Chapter 2. Moreover, the ancestors commonly associated with migrations to Hawai‘i appear near the end of the Kumulipo in the fifteenth wā; navigators such as Maui and Nanamaoa. ‘Ōiwi tradition supports their long presence in the islands while maintaining stories of migrations. The Papa Kū‘auhau did not analyze these stories but mentions the ancestral lines, Hanala‘anui and Hanala‘aiki, in their report.

Traditions in the Board’s report conflicted with suppositions put forward by other historians, many of whom were foreign but there were also some interesting differences between the Board’s suppositions and those put forward by other ‘ōiwi intellectuals. This

is most notable in reference to the Kumuhonua traditions that liken ‘ōiwi origins to Christian beliefs. This distinction plays an interesting role in the publication of Kalākaua’s *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*. The primary point of dissension from the Board’s perspective in relation to foreign accounts of Hawaiian origins was the explicit use of language associations to map Pacific migrations. Using different methodologies to understand origins reflected the cultural contexts in which scholars in and outside of Hawai‘i were embedded. It is significant that after more than seventy years of foreign influence, much of which perpetuated discourses of savagery that degraded many forms of ‘ōiwi practice, traditional knowledge was used as the primary source of verification for determining a topic as prominent as ‘ōiwi origins. This is not to suggest that other ways of knowing were de-valued and at many points in the Board’s report this is made clear especially in connecting Hawaiians and Polynesians to the rest of the world.

Furthermore, Kalākaua encouraged and utilized foreign influences in many ways throughout his reign—intellectually, politically, technologically and aesthetically, as did many ‘ōiwi living at the time, this was an integral aspect of what it meant to ho‘oulu lāhui, to increase the nation utilizing the available tools but based in ‘ōiwi epistemologies. Exemplified throughout the Board’s report is the ‘ōiwi appreciation for multiplicity, including modern scientific ideas and technology equally useful in supporting other parts of their work.

The Board’s interests in distinguishing between language and oral traditions in determining Pacific migrations were twofold. The Board asserted that migrations occurred from Hawai‘i well before historians in the 19th century predicted. But, they were also interested in the idea of two Oceanic continents that had become submerged

due to geological disturbances over time. From this perspective, the islands were the mountain peaks of these once existent continents. Combining ‘ōiwi traditions and modern technology made these ideas plausible and the deep-sea soundings offered insights into both assertions.

The Papa Kū‘auhau intended to arrive at a “correct hypothesis to account for the existence of its prehistoric people” (1884, 11). This predicated the need for maps of deep-sea soundings. These maps were drawn from soundings made off of the coasts of the American continent, Asia and Hawai‘i. Individual soundings were taken between each of the channels between the islands (Ibid). The evidence from these maps was meant to solve some of the issues presented by other writers and historians advancing ideas on ‘ōiwi origins contrary to the Board’s own findings. The Board acquired these maps from the Surveyor General’s Department of the Hawaiian Islands at the request of the mō‘ī. Kalākaua wrote specifically to Lieutenant G.E.G. Jackson requesting his assistance in drawing other maps. He wrote, “I am becoming more and more convinced of the correctness of your theory regard[ing] the subsidence of a Pacific Continent” (Letter from Kalākaua to G.E.G. Jackson, n.d.). Kalākaua goes on to criticize ethnographers stating that, “the error on their part, seems to me that they have taken in some instances the present formation to draw their deduction by the migrations and dispersions of Races...entirely ignoring the past” (Letter). Jackson was quoted in the Board’s report that in his opinion two continents had existed in the Pacific, one in the East and one in the West. He categorized the differences between these locations based on behavior, physical features and level of civilization. According to Jackson, the Western continent consisted of New Guinea, Solomon, New Hebrides, New Caledonia

and the western portion of Fiji. Jackson describes those living on these islands as “Wooly headed people, very black, very savage and much addicted to cannibalism, a race totally different in every respect from the civilized eastern Polynesian” (BOG, 1884, 12). The Eastern continent included Hawaii, Samoa, Tonga, New Zealand and the eastern part of Fiji.

Jackson’s views may have been the kind of discourse the Board was trying to move away from in defining native peoples. But it also suggests the further research interests noted at the conclusion of the Board’s 1884 report including—intellectual and moral faculties, natural propensities, vices (Ibid, 24). Although the Board states that its intentions in the 1884 report is not to raise geological questions related to the possibility of these larger Pacific continents it spends a great deal of time addressing it. In one way, it supports the idea of the long inhabitation of the islands and thus the Board’s position on migration, supported in tradition and carried over through the Kumulipo. From another perspective, belief in these larger continents lends credence to the idea of a broader connection between ‘ōiwi and other peoples of the world. The Board’s report made a number of connections between groups of people through scientific findings as well as native traditions. They were particularly concerned with the dependence of modern day writers on tracing origins and migrations based on affinity of language to the exclusion of all other useful sources, such as tradition and science. In analyzing the deep-sea soundings and lengthy scientific arguments made by other scholars the Board includes in their report, Po‘omaikelani writes that:

These theories although considered speculation by the writer, are but the tentacular touch of science in a direction that may bring forth facts heretofore unknown or indifferently thought of, though, not to the discredit of the opinion of

those who base their theories on migrations alone as the most plausible theory to account for the wide distribution of the purely Polynesian races. Each theory must be taken as a branch to a single tree divergent though its branches may be from the parent stock, still their growth and development may bear the same fruit to the end that will reach a solution of the truth of these scientific problems (1884, 14).

Not only does the above quote suggest the depth of analysis and the import of the subject the Board is attempting to approach, but it also recognizes the ‘ōiwi appreciation for multiple ways of engaging the world, to use and appreciate the differences that prevail to the extent that there exists the recognition that they may all come from the same ‘parent stock’ of thought. The Papa Kū‘auhau makes connections to epistemologies in much the same way it is trying to make connections between peoples of the world elucidating the innovative thought processes embodied in ‘ōiwi systems of knowledge.

Another example of this is in the Board’s usage of the Kaiakahinalii, or great deluge (which was probably a tsunami) remembered and recounted in the Kumulipo. The Kaiakahinalii did not occur at only one point in ‘ōiwi history as told in the Kumulipo, but on four separate occasions that span a number of generations. The Board recognized the commonality of great flood stories around the world and further connected this to the deep-sea soundings. They reflected mostly on the measurements taken between the Hawaiian Islands, as proof that deluges did in fact take place. The Papa Kū‘auhau counters the notion held in what the English version of the Board report calls, “the Mythologies of a Universal Deluge” presumed to have occurred in only one spot and in complete destruction of all people. It is not clear in the report whether or not they are referring specifically to Christian notions of “the Flood” but it is likely considering the influence of Christianity in the Kingdom. Similar to recollecting the Uliuli and Halulu

stories, Kaiakahinialii is relegated to a small portion of the chant's composition. It is only in the eleventh wā that a story is recounted. The imagery in the epilogue of this wā is of a moving, rising, angry sea that covers the land. A warrior wave comes in the night and many people vanish (Beckwith 1981, 109). But the Papa Kū'auhau insisted and indeed it is in the published version of the Kumulipo that this 'deluge' occurred on four separate occasions. The last Kaiakahinialii occurred during the time of Kahikoluamea who is mentioned in the twelfth wā.

The scientific explanation for the many floods having transpired around the world was caused by a disturbance in the earth's crust causing a subsidence of the continents, which, resulted in the flooding of land. Kahikoluamea and his family survived this last disturbance in Hawai'i by clinging to a floating log named Konihia. Evidence of this is found in the disconnection of the Hawaiian Islands, according to the Board. The waters rose and nearly covered Mauna Kea (BOG 1884, 18). The Papa Kū'auhau used tradition to validate science and science to validate tradition by recounting and associating mo'olelo through names thus drawing together global human connections and validating the long presence of 'ōiwi in the islands.

Mo'okū'auhau, Iwi and Technology

Scientific connections to cultural knowledge in the 1884 report most likely began immediately after the collection of mele. The 1882 Board records make further connections specifically between the Kumulipo and biology. Board members in 1882 were primarily focused on the earlier wā, recounting the birth of plants and animals. Evolutionary theories and processes were the main focus of the Board's work at that time which may be one reason the 1884 report focused on broader topics.

The continuity of meanings embedded in the Kumulipo are further strengthened by analyzing the Board's acquisition of iwi and objects. Several of the ali'i remains that were found or gifted to the Board (and by extension the mō'i) were ancestors of Kalākaua and the previous Kamehameha dynasty. Because the mō'i's mo'okū'auhau proved to be such a significant point of dissension for some of his subjects, as evidenced in the genealogical debates of 1873 and 1874, he approximated his genealogy to that of the Kamehameha line in a number of performative ways. Like mo'okū'auhau and discussed in Chapter 2, iwi retain mana preserved in life and death. Hiding the iwi of high-ranking ali'i after their demise was a common practice that ensured mana was left undisturbed. Possessing someone else's iwi gave the bearer access to the mana of that person. The Board report of 1884 specifically states that the mō'i oversaw the certification and reinterment of the iwi 'discovered' by the Board (1884, 8). Kalākaua's actions in relation to the seriousness of the activity were based on his genealogical connection to the iwi and mana of the deceased, which was the reason for his presence.

Although Kalākaua was related to the Kamehameha line, the tie was not close enough to immediately quell the tide of criticism against him during and after the 1874 election period. The Papa Kū'auhau's work made a clearer genealogical association between their ali'i lines. However, the connection echoed beyond the boundaries of family and influenced political choices that represented the active promulgation of traditional practices in new settings and modern ways.

One of the older sets of remains acquired by the Board was a common ancestor of both dynasties, Iwikauikaua. The Board recognized him as an "Ancient King of Hawaii" (9). Iwikauikaua was a great great-grandson of the Hawai'i Island ali'i 'Umi (Pukui and

Korn 1973, 134). The bones of both 'Umi and Kamehameha I, although discussed in the Board's 1884 report, were not explicitly located. They were however, said to be in the same cave (BOG 1884, 10-11). 'Umi had a significant impact on Kalākau's rule as did, Iwikauikaua. The connection between Kalākau, Kamehameha, Iwikauikaua and 'Umi is further affected by their connection to Hawai'i Island. Charlot notes that, "Hawaiian culture is based on the family and the land...Hawaiians praise their own land and taunt others. Origin myths, legends, historical narratives, and stories transmit the accumulated knowledge about a place" (Charlot 2003, 20). Through the island of Hawai'i, their shared ancestors and the commonly known stories about them, Kalākau's stature was elevated using a method embedded in practices recognizable to his culturally literate subjects. Kalākau's legitimacy as a ruler was juxtaposed with his connection to the island from which the ali'i responsible for uniting the aupuni came, as well as ali'i of the past known for their peaceful, prosperous and innovative reigns. These associations were not only confined to the island of Hawai'i. Well before Kamehameha unified the aupuni igniting a Hawai'i-centric tradition, 'Umi's fame was known. Both Kamakau and Fornander write about the significance of this widely accepted understanding continued through 'Umi's well-preserved and extensive genealogy. Fornander writes that, "The genealogical tree of Umi is one of the best preserved in the group, for his descendants were numerous and powerful and spread themselves all over the islands" (Fornander 1996, 100). Kamakau also notes 'Umi's far-reaching influence and the uniqueness of his kingdom. He writes, "There was no kingdom like his. He took care of the old men, the old women, the fatherless, and the common people...He was a religious chief, just in his rule..." (Kamakau 1992, 19). Identifying these links illuminates the multilayered ways

that ali‘i validated, maintained and extended access to power beyond their own lifetimes through a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau. A material example of a mo‘okū‘auhau connection is found in the substructure of ‘Iolani Palace.

Prior to the construction of the Palace, Kalākaua brought pōhaku (stones) taken from Kūki‘i heiau in Puna, Hawai‘i to place in the foundation (Kamehiro 2006, 19). Kūki‘i was constructed during ‘Umi’s reign and incorporated the hewn stone style ‘Umi was known for (Fornander 1996, 100). The stones held the mana of both Kalākaua’s ancestor as well as the religious site they were taken from investing ‘Iolani Palace with heiau-like qualities and an association to ‘Umi’s rule. The material connections between Kūki‘i heiau and ‘Iolani Palace enhanced the familial, spiritual and political relationships between ‘Umi and Kalākaua within a genealogical framework. ‘Umi’s building projects like Kūki‘i heiau reflected his ability as a ruler to manage labor and resources while maintaining peace for prolonged periods of time (Kamehiro 2006, 20). Kalākaua sought control over similar activities during his rule. He worked to perpetuate the chiefly behavior indicative of ‘Umi’s reign through the building of ‘Iolani Palace as a sacred structure that reflected the economic, political and cultural success of his own reign (Ibid, 20-21). Though the Palace represented an ‘ōiwi chiefly structure, it was built using modern architectural advancements like concrete slabs and incorporated technological innovations such as electricity and indoor plumbing that were new inventions not only in Hawai‘i but in the world. Kalākaua was actively increasing the nation’s technological and intellectual capacity while perpetuating ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge within a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau and in a manner that embodied his vision to ho‘oulu lāhui.

Kalākaua's authority within a strictly 'ōiwi frame of reference may have been legitimized through 'Umi, but it was also symbolic of sovereign authority in a modern nation.

Other ali'i remains in the Board's collection included Kepo'okalani, Keaweaheulu, Keōua, 'Aikanaka and many more who tied Kamehameha and Kalākaua together. These iwi were found in caves at Kamilo, Wai'ōhinu, Ka'ū and at Hoaiku, Ka'awaloa. Found with the iwi at Hoaiku was Ka Ipu Makani a Laa'maomao, the Wind Gourd of La'amaomao. The Papa Kū'auhau's report notes that the iwi of Līloa and Lonoikamakahiki were deposited in the Royal Tomb of Kawānanakoa, Honolulu, O'ahu, after having been removed from Hoaiku, Ka'awaloa during the reign of Kamehameha IV. (BOG 1884, 10). Again Kalākaua is perpetuating the practices of earlier ali'i in ways that elevate his mana, maintain 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge, and ho'oulu lāhui. Yet, it was not only for genealogical reasons that Kalākaua associated himself with the Kamehameha dynasty and in particular Kamehameha Paiea. Kalākaua's political aspirations and cultural grounding aligned with those of the Kamehameha I. Traveling abroad, establishing an Oceanic empire/alliance and making trade agreements with foreign countries were part of both rulers' policies. Kamehameha I and Kalākaua embraced foreign tools and incorporated foreign technologies but remained secure in appreciating the value of 'ōiwi ingenuity. Kalākaua's rule appeared to be a continuation of Kamehameha Paiea's (Charlot 1985, 5).

Ka Ipu Makani a La'amaomao was an acquisition equally important in establishing mana dependent upon a framework of mo'okū'auhau. The Board report states, "The Ipu Makani of Laamaomao was procured from this cave, and is now in possession of His Majesty at the Palace. The discovery of this ancient relic is important,

as it is connected with many of the ancient legends of the country” (BOG 1884, 9). Many kinds of sources constitute the transmission of knowledge and validation of mana. As the Papa Kū‘auhau stated, the Ipu Makani was significant because of its relation to important mo‘olelo as it was an integral part of the story of Pāka‘a and Kūapāka‘a and relates customs and modes of behavior between ali‘i and iwikuamo‘o (a near and trusted relative of the chief who attended to his personal needs). The mo‘olelo represents love of the ali‘i, love of the lāhui and love of the ‘āina. It promotes ideas of sovereignty, governance and service. It is a mo‘olelo that is most firmly associated with the island of Hawai‘i given the chief in the story, Keawenuia‘umi is the youngest son of ‘Umi, but takes place on multiple islands connecting it to the broader lāhui. The mo‘olelo touches every island through the winds that blow throughout the pae ‘āina, underlining the intimate relationship to place embedded in mo‘olelo, mele, and mo‘okū‘auhau and as an aspect of ascertaining modes of sovereign expression. Sydney Iaukea contends, “If you knew the name of the makani (wind) that blew through a particular area, you were never lost, both geographically and perhaps epistemologically as well” (Iaukea 2009, 48). In her analysis of Joseph M. Poepoe’s version of the Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo Silva further expounds on the importance of winds in ‘ōiwi culture. Silva gives Poeope’s reason for including the section of Pele calling the winds in his version of the mo‘olelo stating that it “performs a kulana panoonoo or remembering function” to the benefit of the reader (2010, 241). The kulana panoonoo acts as a literary device for organizing and perpetuating knowledge. Pele’s mana is determined by her ability to call the winds from Nihoa to Kaua‘i proving that she is not only knowledgeable but also a kama‘āina—solidifying her association to the ‘āina. In Pele’s recitation of over 273 winds, Silva

dissects the functions it serves to the mo‘olelo. Pele marks her sexual territory over Lohi‘au, her relationships to other akua, her mana to not just call the winds but to command them, and her cosmogonic links to important pōhaku and by extension the islands (Silva 2010, 247-54).

Kalākaua’s possession of the Ipu increased his mana but it was also indicative of chiefly behavior that he connected the Ipu, the mo‘olelo, and mo‘okūauhau through visible cultural articulations. The ‘Moolelo Hawaii o Pakaa a me Ku-a-Pakaa’ was printed as a newspaper serial in the 1860s. A float based on the mo‘olelo was part of Kalākaua’s parade during his jubilee in 1886 (Silva 2004, 114). Thus it became part of both the literary and visual landscape of the late 19th century. The Ipu is further connected to Kalākaua’s concerted effort of perpetuating ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge to a broad (non-Hawaiian) audience through his book, *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*. In the book, the story of ‘The Triple Marriage of Laamaikahiki’ La‘amaomao is portrayed as a man. However, he maintains the same power as the female La‘amaomao recounted in the story of Pāka‘a and Kūapāka‘a, the ability to control the winds (Nakuina 1992, ix).

The mo‘olelo of that time are inextricably linked to the mana in the collections the Papa Kū‘auhau acquired, moreover these mo‘olelo along with the mele, iwi, and cultural objects were acquired and gifted because of the genealogical work the Board was responsible for completing and due to Kalākaua’s sovereign authority embedded within his status as mō‘ī, a position achieved through his mo‘okū‘auhau. Furthermore, the remains of past chiefs and ancient relics represent a text of their own storing information transmitted and read through memories and accumulated ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge. They become part of a written text when the Board records their findings. Moreover,

these ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge connect to both modern technological advances and within a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau, future texts.

The combination of traditional and modern knowledge produced and reflected both the national narrative and national consciousness of Kalākaua’s rule. One particular example that typifies the syncretic nature of the mō‘ī’s endeavors and is rich enough to extrapolate to other areas that connect to the Kumulipo is the introduction of electricity in the Kingdom. Kalākaua’s genealogical connection through the Kumulipo denotes an ‘ōiwi understanding of the phenomenon—concepts can be categorized through various links and associations. To decode the separation of the ideas of traditional and new knowledge, we can further perceive the national narrative and cultural consciousness of Kalākaua’s time through an understanding of his kapu and mana, his relationship with Pele and the introduction of electricity as a manifestation of his sovereign authority to ho‘oulu lāhui.

“Kūkui ‘ā mau i ka [ke] awakea” is the ‘ōlelo no‘eau (proverb) that relates Kalākaua to his ancestor Iwikauikaua through their shared kapu (Pukui 1983, 205). Iwikauikaua is also an ancestor of the Kamehameha family. The privilege of burning torches throughout the day denotes the high rank of Kalākaua and is a manifestation of his mana as both the mō‘ī and a descendent of this particular ali‘i. The torch-burning kapu became intimately associated with Kalākaua from early on in his rule as evidenced by the many chants composed for him. Activities during his rule that honor him such as, torch light processions and the ever-burning torch lit in front of Kalākaua and Kapi‘olani’s early residence at ‘Ihikapulani, also represent his kapu (Pukui and Korn 1973, 134). The connections to heat, fire, light, shining, and burning are further

enhanced by Kalākaua's name, which translates as the day/sun of war. The association between his kapu and his name is clear—the sun produces heat, fire, light, and shines. Kalākaua's kapu is genealogical but also relates him to the visible, resilient, and phenomenological mana of the goddess Pele who is also associated with fire, lightning, shining, heat, creation and destruction. Moreover, her kapua'i (footsteps) are not only bound to the earth but are present across the sea and sky, particularly in the form of clouds and lightning. Pele is a goddess of hula and Kalākaua was often linked to her and thus her mana in oli and mele.

The connections between Kalākaua, his kapu, and Pele as well as the performative aspects of his mo'okū'auhau and mana were further solidified in 'ōiwi national consciousness during the Poni Mō'ī, the Coronation of 1883. In 1881, Kalākaua embarked on a world tour and upon his return continued preparations for completing the construction of 'Iolani Palace and organizing a coronation ceremony. Scholars have described the coronation process as an attempt by Kalākaua to mimic the great rulers of Europe, but plans for the ceremony had been discussed prior to his leaving the Kingdom for the world tour and although decorative in the European and/or American fashion, was embedded within an 'ōiwi cultural context that was equally visible. One of the more apparent acts was the two-week long celebration and performance of hula. Kalākaua invited various hālau hula to perform at the coronation and what is available of the program today shows that all of the hula and oli performed were either directly related to Kalākaua as the ruling monarch, for instance through mele ko'ihonua (cosmogonic genealogies), or were hula for the goddess Pele and those closely associated with her, her sister Hi'iaka and lover Lohiau for example (Papa Kuhikuhi).

Looking at two of the mele in the program, Kalākaua He Inoa and Aia la o Pele, the connection is clear.

Kalākaua He Inoa	Aia la o Pele
Kalākaua he inoa	Aia la o Pele i Hawai‘i ‘eā
Ka pua mae ‘ole i ka lā	Ke ha‘a maila i Maukele ‘eā
He pua maila i ka mauna	‘Ūhi‘ūha mai ana ‘eā
I ke kuahiwi o Mauna Kea	Ke nome a‘ela iā Puna ‘eā
Ke ‘ā lā i Kīlauea	Ka mea nani ka i Paliuli ‘eā
Mālamalama o Wahinekapu	Ke pulelo a‘ela i nā pali ‘eā
A luna o Uēkahuna	Aia ka palena i Maui ‘eā
I ka pali kapu o Ka‘aua	‘Āina o Ka‘aulula‘au ‘eā
Ea mai ke ali‘i kia manu	I hea kāua e la‘i ai ‘eā
Ua wehi i ka hulu o ka mamo	I ka ‘ale nui a‘e li‘a nei ‘eā
Ka pua nani o Hawai‘i	Ha‘ina ia mai ka puana ‘eā
Kalākaua he inoa	No Hi‘iaka nō he inoa ‘eā

The first is a mele inoa (name song) for Kālākaua and is constructed within that context.

The mele inoa reiterates and maintains Kalākaua’s kapu and connection to Pele by listing various locations within her domain such as, Kīlauea, Wahinekapu, and ‘Uēkahuna as well as the concept of light and enlightenment, mālamalama. In 1882, approximately one year before the Poni Mō‘ī, Pele displayed her power through an eruption of Mauna Loa. She was considered a living akua and ‘ōiwi continue to view her as such. Her visibility at this specific time is not necessarily coincidental but can be construed as her consciousness or agency as an akua to demonstrate her mana in a way that confirms Kalākaua’s mana, and thus the lāhui’s. Aia la o Pele describes the characteristics and locations that are important to Pele and her domain. Blowing (‘ūhi‘ūha), eating slowly (nome), rising puffs of fire/smoke rising (pulelo), these are embodiments of Pele in areas specific to both her mana and the island of Hawai‘i. Kalākaua is also linked to the ancestors of the past and adorned with chiefly attributes. He represents the strength of the nation that will not wither in the sun while the life of the lāhui is embodied in his

mo‘okū‘auhau. The associations to light and day in his name and his kapu may have worked to offset the Christian interpretation of mālamalama as firmly embedded in notions of enlightenment and civilization from within a Western tradition as discussed in Chapter 2. Rather, it gives rise to ‘ōiwi conceptions of light manifested in the sovereign authority of the mō‘ī.

Kalākaua’s world tour of 1881 was a pivotal experience that greatly affected the mō‘ī’s view of the world and his own nation. As the first ruler to circumnavigate the globe, Kalākaua was introduced to and made connections with other rulers and important figures throughout the U.S., Asia, Egypt, and Europe. It was during the Kalākaua’s stay in Paris that he attended an electric light show exhibition and met with Thomas Edison’s representatives. In New York a meeting was arranged between the mō‘ī and Edison and they discussed the possibility of powering Honolulu with electricity by harnessing Pele’s geothermal energy and transmitting it through underwater cables to Honolulu. This never came to fruition due to the expense that it would have incurred but Edison’s representatives maintained contact with the Kingdom.

The first display of electric light in Honolulu took place on July 21, 1886. Lights in front of the Palace, the Opera House, and the Government building as well as the streets connecting these buildings were turned on in an ceremony that nearly 5000 people attended. Kalākaua rode out on horseback accompanied by his military officers and officially began the presentation. The Hawaiian language newspapers indicated that the lighting of Honolulu was astonishing and that some people were frightened by the noise that was made by turning the lights on. Clearly it was a momentous event given the number of people that attended and their reactions noted in the newspapers. It is

significant that the areas lit during this time were buildings that directly related to the Kalākaua's mana and position. The Government building where he conducted the business of running a nation, 'Iolani palace, his home and the symbol of the monarchy, and the Opera House. Kalākaua and his three siblings were widely recognized as Nā Lani 'Ehā, the four chiefs, all of whom were great composers of poetry and song. Kalākaua's interests in art, music and poetry were meaningful in relation to his governance of the nation as he promulgated traditional forms of artistic expression and supported new methods of artistic production. Reiterating the chiefly attributes associated with the promulgation of culture, Kalākaua encouraged a wide range of artistic development during his reign, this encouragement worked to ho'oulu lāhui in creative expression while also promulgating 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge. He was in regular contact with a number of well-known artists around the world and encouraged the recognition of 'ōiwi art forms of an equal scale. This was done through exhibitions at world fairs, the publication of his book and the press attention given to his coronation ceremony that documented the events that took place. Furthermore, these artistic expressions promoted innovation and creativity as a significant aspect of chiefly kuleana and 'ōiwi national consciousness.

A second display of electric power occurred during the King's Jubilee in November of 1886 and soon after that he outfitted the entire 'Iolani Palace from basement to attic with the newly invented incandescent light bulbs. The Palace is the first home of any ruler around the world to have electricity. Private consumption of this technology did not occur in Honolulu until 1888. I interpret these events as a

continuation of Kalākaua's kapu in modern form, as one aspect of his project to ho'oulu lāhui.

It is also important to point out the terminology used to describe this new technology. Nā ipukukui uwila (uila) is the terminology used to describe the incandescent light bulbs in the Hawaiian language newspapers. These are 'ōiwi words used to name a new technological advancement within an 'ōiwi cultural understanding rather than a Hawaiianized English term like kelepono (telephone). 'Ōiwi were able to conceptualize electricity through observation of the natural world translated to the time and reflective of patterns of modernization. 'Uila, lightning, in an 'ōiwi context is associated with the gods (like Pele) and in mo'olelo only those with a high kapu can wield that mana. 'Uila as electricity was both understood and reflected within a 'ōiwi epistemology. In this way, the Kalākaua used tradition and modern technology to symbolize his national and international (given that this modern technology was first incorporated in Hawai'i) mana as an emblem of the lāhui. He reinforces his sovereign authority through 'ōiwi manifestations coupled with modern technological advancements.

Framing innovations and the resurgence of 'ōiwi traditions helps to focus on the many ways the ali'i, and Kalākaua in particular utilized their agency to actively engage the processes of governance. Kalākaua led in a way that was expected by the people—to flourish culturally, spiritually, and intellectually. These aspects of chiefly behavior coincide with and are in fact active promulgations of Kalākaua's promotion of ho'oulu lāhui. Kalākaua used the resources available, his kapu and his mana associated with light and electricity and further connected it to modern technologies. These new concepts made linkages with 'ōiwi cultural notions that preceded the actual technology. Through

Kalākaua's accumulated mana passed down within his mo'okū'auhau the introduction of electricity acted as further manifestation of his kapu.

Forging intellectual, political, and cultural connections outside of Hawai'i, which was one purpose for Kalākaua's world tour, was another way in which Kalākaua promoted his sovereign authority as mō'i imagined in 'ōiwi and Western contexts. It was also an important aspect of his push to ho'oulu lāhui. The intellectual exchange between Kalākaua and Adolf Bastian is one site in which global connections were manifested to promote mo'okū'auhau, 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge, and national consciousness.

Adolf Bastian and the International Context

Part of Kalakaua's greater agenda in his encouragement to ho'oulu lāhui was the acknowledgement of Hawai'i's cultural value to the outside world and through his authority as a leader of a modern nation. Adolf Bastian provided an interesting outlet for the mō'i to make traditional knowledge accessible outside of Hawai'i. However, what this meeting of the minds also made evident was the very different orientations to culture and knowledge held by Bastian and Kalākaua. As an anthropologist, Adolf Bastian was interested in human cultures around the world and viewed this knowledge as a means to interpreting and understanding culture during his lifetime. His work largely focused on the links between traditions, beliefs and world-views. He was a prolific writer and data collector and his work was a major influence on the establishment of ethnography/ethnology as a discipline. Bastian believed that the universality of cultures maintained the connective threads of mankind that his work attempted to define. He wrote that, "Ethnologie offers a comparative explanation for many customs of which we

have learned from an advancing literature...Ethnologie still comes upon these customs in living development amongst primitive races..." (Bastian 1881, 60).

Engaging in cultural processes around the world provided Bastian with a critical view of a science that relied too heavily on observation and left out philosophical considerations. The philosophies manifested in cultural practices were equally relevant to an understanding of mankind, he believed. A purely scientific rendering did not fully consider the nature of man that Bastian was interested in (Gruber 1985, 382). Likewise, he was often criticized by scientists of his day for his 'unscientific' engagement with the world.

The meeting of minds between Bastian and Kalākaua was significant in putting forth both of their agendas. They sought to connect 'ōiwi culture on a global scale and to represent the long habitation of 'ōiwi in the islands. Interpreting the Kumulipo provided the means for wide spread dissemination of both theories. But whereas Kalakaua did this as part of a process to validate his authority, perpetuate an outward manifestation of the nation's sovereignty and maintain 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge, Bastian was concerned with preserving the ideas of the nature-folk who, in his estimation were on the verge of "disappear[ing] like snow before the midday sun" (Bastian 1881, 63).

Although sympathetic to the plight of preserving 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge and genuinely curious about them, Bastian exudes a paternalistic tone in his writings about those he categorized as 'nature-folk'. Yet, he seemed sincerely concerned with the loss of knowledge and particularly as it related to an understanding of his own cultural grounding. He writes in regard to preserving and learning the beliefs held in native cultures, "How different would be the general view of antiquity and consequently of the

foundations of our own culture, of which our understanding would be far deeper and more correct” (64). This statement suggests unwillingness on the part of his European contemporaries to take native knowledge seriously as a means to better understand European or Western ontologies, epistemologies, origins, cultural production and so forth. A similar orientation is certainly evident in Christian missionary perspectives discussed in the dissertation that assumed cultural, intellectual, and political supremacy upon arriving on ‘ōiwi shores. Moreover, unwillingness to engage in the knowledge formations of others stands directly in contrast to the many ways in which ‘ōiwi engaged with other epistemologies to support and/or sustain a thriving intellectual, cultural, and political life, a well-lived life, a bios of the lāhui. Bastian lamented the loss of knowledge and placed the blame on his own generation and we can infer on those of Euro-American background, “having carelessly wasted the many golden opportunities for study which present contact with the nature folk has so abundantly offered” (1881, 65). Bastian considered it his ‘sacred duty’ to preserve this information.

Die Heilige Sage der Polynesier was published in 1881. Bastian’s commentary on life in modern 19th century Hawai‘i describes a culture rapidly declining as a result of “unhindered influence of European civilization with all its complications on mankind in his primitive condition” (Ibid, 63). Bastian believed that primitive native cultures immediately began to degrade when met by outside influence. Hawai‘i, in Bastian’s estimation, had undergone this process to the extent that ethnological collections were equally unknown to ‘ōiwi as they were to Europeans. Intellectual life had evolved from old and thus weaker perspectives to “newer and stronger thought circles” (Ibid, 65). And the ancient language of the Kumulipo made it difficult for ‘ōiwi of the 19th century to

interpret, according to Bastian. These challenges were levied by Bastian's introduction to some of the intellectuals and leading members of Hawaiian society.

During his one-month visit to Hawai'i Bastian was fortunate to meet individuals who held similar interests in the preservation of 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge and culture, including Kalākaua who allowed Bastian access to sections of the Kumulipo manuscript. "The greatest treasure of all, as I soon discovered, was to be found where it should rightfully be, that is to say in the possession of the highest in the land, the King himself..."(Ibid, 66). Kalākaua and Bastian spent time together discussing its many aspects and insights into ancient wisdom. Bastian's reading of the Kumulipo was greatly influenced by Kalākaua's interpretation and at various points in Bastian's text he acknowledges his perspectives. This proved challenging for my own reading of the text. At which point is Bastian providing the reader with his own thoughts un-influenced by the Mō'ī? At which points does he fail to cite the Kalākaua's assistance in establishing a particular idea? These questions require at least a nominal sifting through of the text to extract Bastian's ideas from the Kalākaua's. To some extent they share a common purpose(s) in exposing and perpetuating 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge as valuable to the thought worlds of mankind. They both make connections between 'ōiwi modes of thought and the spiritual/religious beliefs of other cultures around the world. There are many similarities between some of these cultural beliefs. Bastian saw this as the 'universality' of mankind and thus necessary to preserve. Kalākaua may have seen it in a similar light, but he also viewed these connections as a way to not only enhance but to assert his sovereign authority and the lāhui through reclaiming traditions and incorporating them into the modern 19th century and his leadership. Kalākaua, I argue,

saw the usefulness of ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge for solving or addressing issues of the modern world. As a leader he had the power to incorporate that idea into his rule, making these traditions part of a national consciousness and/or narrative, a consequential difference between Kalākaua and Bastian’s perspectives in terms of the utility of the Kumulipo is in its breadth of application. Whereas Kalākaua saw the chant as a storehouse of many kinds of knowledge important for grasping the world in all of its capacities, Bastian’s text places more significance on its spiritual and religious components.

After briefly reviewing the development of life up to the birth of La‘ila‘i, Bastian raises a salient question, he asks, in what way does all this concern us? (Ibid, 76) For Kalākaua and the lāhui it establishes and reiterates mana and the mō‘ī’s authority as a ruler while perpetuating ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge in and outside of Hawai‘i. Kalākaua in his meetings with Bastian maintained the importance of his personal connection to the Kumulipo; after the genealogies of ancient chiefs “and then seven generations more up to the present king...while other lines lead to Kamehameha whose family died out” (Ibid, 75). The text is primarily focused on the significance of the Kumulipo from a spiritual or religious perspective. Incorporating the natural world is part of Bastian’s analysis but the focus is on the connections between ali‘i and akua throughout the cultures Bastian is knowledgeable of. The Kumulipo is repeatedly referred to as a temple song and the link to the akua is one way for ali‘i to validate and maintain mana. “The unbroken firmly united connection between the world of gods and the world of men as represented by their Kings is seen in Polynesian mythology everywhere...in an especial way in Hawaii” (Ibid, 103).

Connections to Japanese Origin Traditions

Associations between gods, the natural world and humans in creation stories from Japan resonate with the Kumulipo and serve Bastian's purpose of defining universal principles between cultures. Bastian's text relays Shinto origins in the history of the dynasties of Japanese gods. In the Shinto spiritual view, according to Bastian, existence began in the state of chaos in the form of an egg. The egg trembled and swayed till the god Kami emerged at the same time the Asi plant was formed (Ibid, 77). As the gods emerge their unions are spiritual (not sexual) until Isa naghi and Isa na mi-no join together and birth first the island Awasino and other islands later until they are habitable. They then birth a daughter (Ibid, 101). Papa and Wākea share a somewhat similar story and Bastian notes this in his text making the further connection to Greek Mythology through the birth/story of Aegiale, daughter of Helios (Ibid, 101). The duality between gods and plants in the Japanese tradition reflects a duality similarly found in the Kumulipo. The Shinto religion shares a reverence for nature also found in Hawaiian tradition.

Kalākaua showed an interest in Japanese culture and religion throughout at least part of his reign, but it is unclear if the comparison made in Bastian's text reflects conversations the two men had or if the King's regard was newly born because of their discussions. Regardless of the impetus for his curiosity, when Kalākaua left Hawai'i in early 1881 and embarked on his world tour, his first main stop was Japan where he furthered his interest in Japanese society. Kalākaua left Hawai'i to travel the world incognito but word of his voyage had reached Japan before his arrival. When the steamer Oceanic made port in the Yokohama harbor the King was greeted by the Hawaiian flag

raised on all of the man-of-war stationed in the bay. Kalākaua spent his time in Japan as a guest of the Emperor (P.C.A. 1881, 84).

During his visit, Kalākaua held audience with many high-ranking officials, including the Emperor, which was a rare honor. His main activities included, watching military practices, touring educational facilities and visiting Shinto and Buddhist temples. Kalākaua made a number of thought-provoking observations on his trip that relate to the work of the Board and Kalākaua's interests in religion, science, and the arts. This trip also provided him with the opportunity to witness non-Euro/American rule.

Kamana Beamer briefly analyzed Kalākaua's stay in Japan and Siam. He suggests that the meetings between Kalākaua and the Emperor of Japan and the King of Siam offered insights into Kalākaua's position as a non-European ruler in the 19th century and the many pressures by these countries and in Hawai'i's case, the United States, to conform to Euro/American political (and to a certain extent cultural) leanings. This may have been the impetus for Kalākaua's desire to strengthen ties between the Kingdom and other non-European countries through the Asian and Oceanic alliances (Beamer 2009, 230). These political pressures were contrasted by cultural and societal expressions that resonated with the mō'ī's ideas for his own Kingdom. The connection between politics, culture and education as they played out in Japan were apparent in his journal writing. During a visit to the Civil Engineering School he averred the pride that the Japanese took in their work and in exhibiting both their inventiveness and modern advancement--important qualities for the lāhui. The level of self-sufficiency of the Japanese government in printing its own money, educating its own people and creating its own

machinery deeply effected Kalākaua's perspectives as similar activities were carried out by foreigners in the Kingdom (Journals).

On the spiritual front, Kalākaua's tours of the Japanese temples opened realms of inquiry into evolutionary processes and connections between early Christian and Buddhists rituals; Kalākaua specifically commented on the existence of the latter religion long anterior to that of the former. At one stop, Kalākaua questioned the high priest regarding the meaning of placing statues of monkeys at the entrance to the temple. Kalākaua wondered if they held the belief that they were descended from these animals. The high priest hesitated before answering that it was an imaginary idea. Kalākaua wrote about his disappointment in the high priest's answer but appreciated the commentary by the sub-priest although Kalākaua does not say what his comments were (Journals). It leads one to question if the high priest's reluctance to provide a deeper answer was not influenced by his lack of knowledge in regard to the mō'i's spiritual and religious associations. An evolutionary (religious) perspective that man descended from monkeys would not have been acceptable from a Christian point of view and Christianity had certainly made a presence in Japan at the time of Kalākaua's visit. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser in keeping the Kingdom citizens abreast of Kalākaua's trip wrote that the mō'i had accepted an invitation to visit the First Christian Church in Yokohama to which, "the people of his Kingdom had so liberally contributed, many years ago" (PCA 1881, 46). However, Kalākaua was probably genuinely interested in the priest's ideas given that his own interests concerned the evolution of man stemming from his involvement in interpreting and analyzing the Kumulipo in conjunction with scientific principles.

Referring to notes taken in his conversations with Kalākaua, Bastian introduces the first wā of the Kumulipo as beginning in a similar state of chaos to that found in the Japanese version. This is an interpretation made by Kalākaua as Bastian indicates. The text of the Kumulipo does not suggest that a previous world existed and a new one emerged “from the burned out one revolving upwards again...the rising of a new world after the destruction of an earlier one” (Bastian 1881, 106). Why would Kalākaua interpret the opening lines as such? To answer this, we may have to consider the popular idea amongst the mō‘ī’s circle of intellectuals of two large Pacific continents having been submerged due to a natural albeit catastrophic event. The convulsion of the earth’s crust at some point in history would conceivably have had a major impact on the geography and geology of the world. No further reference is made to this particular interpretation but Bastian’s relationship making between Hawaiians and other cultures—Polynesians, Japanese, Greeks, Egyptians, Incas, Indians—resonated with Kalākaua’s perspectives in regard to the continents and the way they connected Hawaiians with other groups of people. Furthering this idea became a major part of the work of the Board of Genealogy.

Bastian asks, “What is the connection between philosophy and religion?” Assuming that these are Bastian’s own thoughts and ideas, it is interesting to note his observations of national consciousness and cultures. He asserts that they revolve around the wheel of time coming in and out of existence, back and forth between strength and weakness (Ibid, 72). Through the developments of societies the processes of growth and destruction affect culture and thus religious/spiritual perspectives. Spiritual revelation is, as a result of “an unavoidable but indispensable amalgamation with political institutions” presented with societal difficulties. One such difficulty is between science and religion.

Religion cannot attest to scientific developments that can better explain the world and science can provide no substitute for religion satisfying to the people (Ibid, 144-47).

Kalākaua's initiatives to ho'oulu lāhui through the promotion of a national cultural consciousness are nearly opposite to Bastian's understandings. Kalākaua, through the Board's work supports the connections between science, religious/spiritual thought and the necessity of both to the national narratives and cultural consciousness of the lāhui. The Kumulipo depicts the development of the universe in scientific terms, it utilizes scientific method and it encompasses this information in a spiritual/religious aesthetic form. Conflicts from a Euro-American perspective, between scientific ways of knowing and spiritual ones do not exist in 'ōiwi epistemologies. The scientific method is the method used by 'ōiwi to understand and engage the world. Kalākaua and the Papa Kū'auhau used this tradition along with modern scientific form to arrive at a number of conclusions that simultaneously validate and perpetuate 'ōiwi bodies of knowledge and method, the nation and the mō'ī's rule.

In Bastian's description of the earlier wā, he approaches the birth of species using scientific terms relevant at the time—zoophytes, cephalopods—but also discusses the difficulty in determining many of the species birthed because only their 'ōiwi names were known. Bastian was unable to cross-reference the English names with their scientific classifications. In 1882 the Board of Genealogy undertook this work. The records of their activities at the time show their interest in scientific and evolutionary ideas. Using the birth of life in the first few wā the Board analyzed and compared the Hawaiian names to the scientific terms used to define the earliest forms of life. The life forms birthed from Kumulipo and Pō'ele were paired and compared with their scientifically named

counterparts. The Board was extremely interested in deducing the evolution of life on earth, not just in Hawai‘i and the Kumulipo provided the knowledge from which to begin this research. It acted as a guide in cultural and scientific endeavors continuing the process of ka ‘imi loa and contradicting Bastian’s perspective that spiritual principles and scientific ideals could not work together in a manner satisfying to societies.

Increasing the Nation

If mo‘okū‘auhau is the most secure form of transmitting information within ‘ōiwi intellectual traditions, then prose narrative constituted the least secure (Charlot 1997, 57). Prose narrative was open to the inclusions made depending upon who was telling the story. Creativity and attention to detail were still extremely important incorporations but the material was not completely memorized or challenged as in the debates over genealogies. Kalākaua used prose narrative to disseminate ‘ōiwi knowledge outside of Hawai‘i through the publication of his book *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii: The Fables and Folklore of a Strange People*. The book was published in 1888, the year prior to Kalākaua’s publication of the Kumulipo. It recounts stories related to the cultural and national consciousness Kalākaua advocated through the work of the Papa Kū‘auhau and in connection with the Kumulipo. However, it also highlights Kalākaua’s artistic sense and again draws commonalities and connections to other parts of the world. It is arguable that the publication of *Legends* was, on one level, meant as a kind of cultural propaganda marking Hawai‘i as equal in artistic invention and cultural depth as other great civilizations, most notably Greece. Analyzing the publication of *Legends* alongside the efforts made with the Kumulipo emphasizes some interesting points. First, the

connections between the mo‘olelo in the book and the Kumulipo are unmistakable when read by a culturally literate audience. However, since the culturally literate subject was not necessarily the intended audience of the book, it may not have been widely associated. Furthermore, the publication of the Kumulipo did not occur until a year or so after *Legends*, so the connection may have been further obscured. Blatantly put forward in the introduction by Daggett, is the possible connections between ‘ōiwi and a lost tribe of Israel. This is a topic that the Papa Kū‘auhau did not examine in its research and to a certain extent the report of 1884 can be read as an attempt to contradict such notions. Further, the stories in *Legends* give prominence to Kalākaua’s genealogical connections with great and noteworthy ancestors. Lastly, although Daggett draws links between ‘ōiwi traditions and Christianity, the story of Kekuākalani firmly asserts the mō‘ī’s regard for the older traditions as he subtitles the chapter, ‘The last great defender of the Hawaiian gods’.

Kalākaua’s appreciation for and mastery of many different forms of art was exemplified in his personal journals, musical compositions and relationships with artists around the world. While on his world tour Kalākaua enjoyed music in Vienna and Italy, architecture and fashion in Paris and theater in Japan. In Hawai‘i he attended the Opera and composed many memorable and important mele as contributions to the perpetuation of ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge. His journals are rife with impromptu poems. Visiting other locations and recognizing the cultural dominance of some of these countries may have been one aspect that encouraged Kalākaua to disseminate some of the mo‘olelo within his own culture that he was so fond of. Writing *Legends* is an extension of those endeavors, and likewise an effort to ho‘oulu lāhui.

The foreword to *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii* was written by Glen Grant, and in it he remarks that the book was written “for an international audience, Kalākaua’s anthology transforms a rich variety of folktales and legends into stylized literature through the use of ornate language, contrived dialogues between historical and traditional figures, and frequent allusions to Greco-Roman and medieval times” (Grant 1990, iii). Indeed, the first story told is called ‘Hina the Helen of Hawai‘i’. The close approximation between Hawai‘i and Greece is meant to denote the long presence of Hawai‘i’s culture in the history of mankind. The prose narrative style allowed the Kalākaua to include references that would be meaningful to his target audience but would not deter too significantly from the point of his storytelling. He regularly comments that the characters in the mo‘olelo are historical figures and the experiences historical moments and events, drawing on their relevance during his own lifetime. For instance, in the mo‘olelo about Iwikauikaua which he titles ‘The Adventures of Iwikauikaua’ Kalākaua writes, “with this adventurous and erratic chief originated, it is claimed, the custom of burning kukui torches by daylight on state occasions...it was within the present generation that...the royal families claiming the prerogative through descent from Iwikauikaua” (1990, 349). Though the language is stylized, as Grant states, the message is clear, his illustrious ancestor that he has placed in literature has granted him with the ability to burn torches that mark his authority as a ruler carving out his sovereign space through a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau.

Kalākaua includes stories of many other ancestors who are memorialized in the Kumulipo, which makes the introduction by Daggett so intriguing. The references to the Kumulipo are clear, there are stories of ‘Umi, Kelea and Lono all whom are born in the

sixteenth wā of the Kumulipo. The inclusion of the Kumuhonua story makes an equally clear reference to Christianity blended with ‘ōiwi traditions, “The meaning of Adam is red, and it will be remarked that the Hawaiian Adam was made of earth of that color. He was made in the image of Kane, who breathed into his nostrils, and he became alive” (Ibid, 35). There are undoubtedly multiple reasons for this comparison. On one level, it did not outwardly threaten or question the Christian belief system in Hawai‘i. Missionaries would be pacified although the stories in the book uphold and perpetuate the Hawaiian traditions many of them had fought to suppress. On another level, the broader readership would see similarities between their own histories and values to those of ‘ōiwi residing in a small and distant Kingdom so far from their own comfort zones and familiar places. And in another vein, the Kumuhonua stories are just another of the many traditions that ‘ōiwi were able to accept and adapt to their own epistemologies. As Charlot writes, “The Polynesian method of handling differing traditions was useful when confronting foreign teachings. They could simply be added to the list of schools of thought” (Charlot 1997, 57).

Conclusion

The Kumulipo symbolizes the progressive thought processes of ‘ōiwi extended throughout time and embedded within a mo‘okū‘auhau framework. It represents the motivations of Kalākaua and the vision he had for his lāhui and Kingdom. The Kumulipo’s composition is an example of ‘ōiwi ingenuity and furthered the intention to ho‘oulu lāhui, asserting cultural and political value in the 19th century. The perpetuation

of ‘ōiwi bodies of knowledge, bodies related to and encompassed within the Kumulipo enlivened the cultural, political, and social capacities of the lāhui.

When the Papa Kū‘auhau concluded and presented its report to the 1884 Legislature, the response from some of the missionary descendent members was highly critical of their research and findings. Representative Dole criticized the Board’s work suggesting that their research produced a mere piece of curiosity (Mookini n.d., 5). He further noted that the Papa Kū‘auhau failed to identify and validate any ali‘i genealogies, which was the express reason for the Board’s establishment in Dole’s reckoning (Ibid, 5). Despite these criticisms the Board remained in effect until its abolishment in 1887, after the illegal Bayonet Constitution was forced on Kalākaua. Dole’s statements represent the conflicting political perspectives amongst the broader Kingdom citizenry and should be interpreted as such rather than simply as cultural illiteracy. It served a purpose for missionary descendants and other foreigners to degrade ‘ōiwi cultural traditions. That degradation carried out their political, cultural and financial agendas while promoting a narrative that depicted ‘ōiwi as heathen, savage, uncivilized, and thus unable to rule themselves.

However, the breadth of the Board’s research throughout its many years and was remarkable and depicts a very different picture of ‘ōiwi as uncivilized. The Papa Kū‘auhau members worked to trace a genealogy of mankind based in what the missionaries and anthropologists described as ‘primitive’ culture. They traced the beginning of the world to microbial organisms based on traditional names cross-referenced with ‘foreign’ scientific terms. They undoubtedly had a larger agenda then to

validate the mana of one ali‘i or even the future ali‘i. This was research meant to validate and support the mana of a thriving lāhui.

Chapter 5

Ka Panina Mana‘o

Throughout the dissertation I have argued that the confluence of biopower and mo‘okū‘auhau provides an opening to an affirmative biopolitics. To a certain extent the struggle with Western biopower, as Esposito and Weheliye have pointed out, is based on a political monotheism and a conception of the human envisioned as a reflection of Western man, excluding other ways in which humanity is and can be imagined. If biopower is the mode in which power continues to be expressed in the contemporary era—as a move away from sovereign power—and if the concepts of life and politics are central to “the crisis that force themselves upon our present” then we have very little choice but to engage and demand scholarship that illuminates and draws on theoretical foundations outside the standard Western purview (Campbell and Sitze 2013, 3). In other words, a reconfiguration of the convergence between life and politics is necessary if there is hope for a modern form of biopower that does not descend into a politics of death. I contend that for the field of biopolitics bringing mo‘okū‘auhau into conversation with a Western view of life and politics is one way to furnish that hope.

In each chapter of the dissertation I have worked toward a deconstruction of biopolitics as it has been theorized and expressed in Euro-American contexts in an effort to both inform the field of biopolitics and more deeply understand mo‘okū‘auhau and ‘ōiwi political practices. In much the same way that ‘ōiwi (and Indigenous) scholars have engaged theories of power and forms of dispossession in order to challenge colonial and imperial domination and its devastating after-effects, my engagement with biopower stems from a desire to comprehend the religio-political philosophies that formulated

those relations of power in the first place. In essence, the questions to be asked in considering theories of power and domination are rooted in conceptions of life, what constitutes life, and what is valued as life and it is my contention that particular political practices and traditions emerge from the cultural contexts that define those conceptions. Across the Indigenous world “the politics of blood and the language of race” often defined within a Western worldview continue to hold a primary place in struggles over history, human rights, and sovereignty (Chang 2010, 212). In Australia, for example, Indigenous peoples struggle against a “discourse of pathology” deployed as a weapon of patriarchal white sovereignty. Geonpū scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson affirms that “Race and rights are the means by which patriarchal white sovereignty exercises its power to let live and make live where the granting of life is conditional on the perceived appropriateness of the individual, the measure of which is the good white citizen” (Moreton-Robinson 2011, 77). We are surrounded by a politics embedded in Western worldviews, Western traditions, and Western practices. If the goal is to produce a new politics, a new relationship to power, a new framework for political engagement in order to provide for a better ‘ōiwi future, we must nānā i ke kumu, look to the source, and that source is an ‘ōiwi conception of life and power made visible in mo‘okū‘auhau. Therefore, I argue that an engagement between life and power as it is conceived in Western and ‘ōiwi traditions is one mode of analysis crucial to the development of a new vision. Dene scholar Glen Coulthard puts forth a similar argument in regard to Indigenous peoples and Marxism. He quotes Tsimshian anthropologist Charles Menzies who writes, “Marxism retains an incisive core that helps understand the dynamics of the world we live” (Coulthard 2014, 8). Coulthard continues by acknowledging that Marx’s contributions

“are not without flaw; nor is it meant to suggest that Marxism provides a ready-made tool for Indigenous peoples to uncritically appropriate in their struggles for land and freedom” (Ibid). This sentiment resonates strongly with my own assessment of biopower and mo‘okū‘auhau. In terms of an ‘ōiwi future, first understanding mo‘okū‘auhau as a framework and then defining our own methods of biopolitical expression underlines the possibilities for a form of governance, a political practice that takes life as its center. This life can be envisioned through and by way of mo‘okū‘auhau incorporating human and nonhuman bodies and reconstituting relationships between human and animal, even within our own humanity. In this confluence of Western biopower and mo‘okū‘auhau a similar deconstruction of the familiar modes of sovereign authority that currently divide our lāhui (and the Indigenous world) may be reimagined.

The Future in the Past: Projects and Possibilities

I envisioned this dissertation as a survey of biopolitical and mo‘okū‘auhau oriented examples present within Kalākaua’s reign. In that vein, this work is a beginning stage from which a number of future projects could (and probably should) be built upon. Future projects related to ‘ōiwi history, theory, governance and policy are important considerations.

Potential Theoretical Contributions

There is a general dearth of ‘ōiwi scholarship, particularly in relation to political theory, and any writing produced within the field will add to a growing body of knowledge, what Jodi Byrd refers to as a “nascent indigenous critical theory” (Byrd 2011, xxxv). Contributing to this nascent theory by analyzing the nineteenth century

Hawaiian Kingdom cannot be done without accessing sources in Hawaiian language from newspapers, oral traditions, stories, songs, government documents, wills, and so forth. What is most compelling about these sources, and what I have argued in this dissertation, is that they provide access to ancestral knowledge and ultimately insight into ancestral and Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies, which function as the basis for the formulation of Indigenous critical theory that “exists in its best form when it centers itself within...the specificities of communities and cultures from which it emerges and then looks outward to engage European philosophical, legal and cultural traditions to build upon the allied tools available” (Ibid, xxix-xxx). Critiquing the limits of biopower made way for my own comprehension of the value of mo‘okū‘auhau to the lāhui Hawai‘i and beyond. The theoretical perspectives present within a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau provide incalculable insight for human relations, not just ‘ōiwi, but global human existence. Mo‘okū‘auhau provides space for a different relationship with the environment from the one that currently exists for many people. It provides a new way of thinking about our relationships to animals, water, rocks, sea and sky in the contemporary world, all of which are aspects of the human, natural and spiritual realms that a global citizenry relies upon. Current Western theorists are clearly seeking out new ways to frame and understand relationships with the rest of the world—human and nonhuman, spatial and temporal, natural and spiritual. Donna Haraway, Elizabeth Povinelli and Jonathan Goldberg-Hiller are but a few examples of academics producing scholarship using Indigenous knowledge underpinned by biopolitical and other Western theories in order to grasp life and its relation to power and politics. Povinelli’s work is also an attempt “to illuminate the cramped space in which my Indigenous colleagues are

forced to maneuver as they attempt to keep relevant their critical analytics and practices of existence” (Povinelli 2016, 6). This recognition is important and increased space for ‘ōiwi and Indigenous theoretical contributions should be made. However, beyond an illumination of the cramped space of our existences a greater appreciation for the insights ‘ōiwi and indigenous theoretical perspectives can add to the academic world is also necessary. That appreciation can only occur if we are writing, speaking and inserting ourselves in academia. A further step in the development of a nascent ‘ōiwi or Indigenous theory is its formulation within our own languages and contexts.

Potential Historical Contributions

Although this dissertation analyzed Kalākaua’s reign it by no means covers the extent to which an interrogation of the period would benefit. In particular, building beyond ‘ōiwi articulations of biopower to include haole formulations that functioned in contrast and conflict to ‘ōiwi in the nineteenth century would provide greater insight into the historical and political events of the era. The political actions and motivations surrounding the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, the impact of diseases such as leprosy on the lāhui and the Hawaiian Kingdom government, as well as a more thorough assessment of sex and prostitution are areas worthy of future study.

Potential Policy and Governance Contributions

The lāhui today is at a critical juncture in terms of governance. New possibilities have arisen in regard to building a political relationship with the federal government while at the same time greater advocacy for complete independence from the U.S. is sweeping through our communities. The lāhui may be on the threshold of significant political change and the complex layering of race, gender, and colonialism—layers that

we are bounded by because of our connection to the West—is tied to maintaining or securing sovereignty. In the Indigenous world, how one defines sovereignty both historically and in the contemporary period is dependent upon to what nation one does or did belong. Sovereignty is further complicated by notions of citizenry circling back to the role racial categories play in determining “the perceived appropriateness of the individual” to rights and privileges as a citizen belonging to a sovereign nation. The struggle over sovereignty is two-fold, on the one hand Indigenous nations and peoples struggle to attain or sustain sovereignty over their lands and people, on the other hand Indigenous nations and peoples are subsumed by “white patriarchal sovereignty” exercised by the imperial or colonial governments in which we live. In Moreton-Robinson’s analysis, for example, the measure of the individual that can access these rights and privileges is the “good white citizen” and Northern Territory Indigenous peoples, like other Indigenous peoples including ‘ōiwi, typically fall outside of this designation because they are the “product of dysfunctional cultural traditions and individual bad behaviour” (2011, 68). A future study focused on new ways of conceiving and practicing sovereign authority—whether within a federally recognized government or a fully independent one—based in a framework of mo‘okū‘auhau that privileges life and relationships and is contextualized in the contemporary period would be invaluable.

Ka Hopena

He pou he‘e i ka wawā first appears as line 37 of the Kumulipo. My interpretation of this line conjures the male godly post—pou—slipping into the

tumultuous, resounding, and echoing female godly darkness—wawā.¹⁹ The imagery evoked is both sexual and spiritual and reiterates the procreative power of the universe that brings all life into being—from elements to coral, birds, bats, and human beings. Male and female sexuality as foundational to genealogical construction is reflective of a larger system within ‘ōiwi philosophy that emphasizes dualism in order to achieve balance and order. Balance and a completed or well constructed universe is particularly visible in the correlative and complementary pairs that set the larger boundaries of the world within the Kumulipo discussed in this dissertation—pō/ao, lani/honua, kai/uka, kane/wahine. I chose this line as the title of the dissertation because it brings together the themes of this study—mo‘okū‘auhau, sex, procreation, mana—marking the foundations of an ‘ōiwi worldview and providing an opening for my analysis of how that worldview may have been configured during Kalākaua’s reign. His reign dealt with the ravages of disease and religious intervention that influenced the politics of the period in drastic and life altering ways but that was also grounded in ‘ōiwi concepts and practices.

The line also calls to mind the physical body of a he‘e (octopus) tentacles extended, flowing and grasping as it slips and slides across the dark ocean floor enjoining the additional meanings of the term he‘e (to slide, surf, slip, flee). The imagery of the he‘e as a physical body is equally significant to the contributions this dissertation seeks to make. I imagine mo‘okū‘auhau tentacularly touching all aspects of life extending across the temporal, spatial, political, social, cultural and intellectual realms of ‘ōiwi existence as the tentacles of the he‘e unfurl and clasp the various reef formations holding fast to rocks and coral as it moves fluidly through the water. Donna Haraway writes, “I

¹⁹ In Kalākaua’s manuscript included in the appendices of Martha Beckwith’s version of the Kumulipo the line reads, “He po uhe‘e i ka wawa” and is translated as “darkness slips into light.” John Charlot notes that this is unidiomatic and argues the version used in this dissertation.

remember that *tentacle* comes from the Latin *tentaculum*, meaning “feeler,” and *tentare*, meaning “to feel” and “to try”...tentacular ones make attachments and detachments; they make cuts and knots; they make a difference; they weave paths” (2016, 31).

Mo‘okū‘auhau cuts across the terrains of life in a similar fashion, touching, feeling, carving paths and forming attachments and connections in intricate and entangled webs of understanding. In making my own cuts and knots the analyses and interpretations presented in this dissertation designate the messiness, the complications and complexities, along with the beauty and production—the tumult—the noisy disorder that exists in the intervention of life and politics.

References

- Abad, Carolyn Kēhaunani Cachola. 2000. "The Evolution of Hawaiian Socio-Political Complexity: An analysis of Hawaiian oral tradition." PhD. Diss., University of Hawai'i.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- , 2004. *The Open*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Arista, Noelani. 2007. Foreword to *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawaii*, by Martha Beckwith, iv-xiii. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- , 2010a. "Navigating Uncharted Oceans of Meaning: *Kaona* as Interpretative and Historical Method", *PMLA*, 125.3 (2010), 663-669.
- , 2010b. "I ka mo'olelo nō ke ola: In History There is Life", *Anglistica* 14.2: 15-23.
- , 2010c. "Histories of Unequal Measure: Euro-American Encounters with Hawaiian Governance and Law, 1793-1827." PhD Diss., Brandeis University.
- Armstrong, William N. 1904. *Around the World With a King*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Basham, Leilani. "Ka Lāhui Hawai'i and Peoplehood: Native Hawaiian Identity as Genealogy, Cultural Practice, and Political Independence." *N.d.*
- Bastian, Adolf. 1881. *Die Heilige Sager der Polynesier*. Partial Translation by Root. L. 21 Bishop Museum, Honolulu.
- Beamer, Kamanaikalani. 2014. *No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation*. Honolulu, Kamehameha Publishing.
- Beckwith, Martha Warren. 1972. *The Kumulipo: A Hawaiian Creation Chant*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- , 2007. *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Bingham, Hiram. 1848. *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands: or the Civil Religious, and Political History of Those Islands*. New York: Sherman Converse.

- Brown, Marie Alohālani. 2016. *Facing the Spears of Change: The Life and Legacy of John Papa ʻĪʻĪ*. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.
- Byrd, Jodi A. 2012. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Campbell, Timothy and Adam Sitze, eds. 2013. *Biopolitics: A Reader*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Campbell, Tom. 2013. *Dyslexia: The Government of Reading*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chang, David A. 2010. *The Color of the Land: Race, Nation, and the Politics of Landownership in Oklahoma, 1832-1929*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- , 2016. *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Charlot, John. 1983. *Chanting the Universe: Hawaiian Religious Culture*. Honolulu and Hong Kong: Emphasis International.
- , 1985. *The Hawaiian Poetry of Religion and Politics: Some Religio-Political Concepts in Postcontact Literature*. Monograph Series, Number 5. The Institute of Polynesian Studies, Polynesian Cultural Center, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, Lāʻie, Hawaiʻi.
- , 1997. “Classical Polynesian Thinking.” In *A Companion to World Philosophies*, ed. Eliot Deutsch and Ron Bontekoe. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- , 2001. “Nīʻau’s Dirge for His Own Soul.” In *Pacific 2000: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Easter Island and the Pacific*, edited by Christopher M. Stevenson, Georgia Lee, and F.J. Morin, 393-398. Los Osos: Bearsville Press.
- , 2003. “Prophet of the Earth Overturned: Keʻāulumoku on Early Contact in Hawaiʻi.” *Rongorongo Studies* 13, no. 1:20-36.
- , 2005. *Classical Hawaiian Education: Generations of Hawaiian Culture* [CD-ROM]. Lāʻie, HI: Brigham Young University-Hawaiʻi, Pacific Institute.
- , 2010. “Two Early Hawaiian-Christian Chants.” *Anthropos* 105: 29-46.
- Cook, Kealani R. 2011. *Kahiki: Native Hawaiian Relationships with other Pacific Islanders, 1850-1915*. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.

- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Daws, Gavan. 1974. *Shoal of Time: History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 2001. *Pure Immanence: Essays on Life*. New York: Zone Books.
- Deutscher, Penelope. "Foucault's *History of Sexuality, Volume I*: Re-reading its Reproduction." *Theory, Culture & Society* 29 (2012) 119-137.
- Ellis, William. 2005. *A Narrative of an 1823 Tour Through Hawai'i or Owhyhee*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.
- Esposito, Roberto. 2008. *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- , 2013a. *Terms of the Political: Community, Immunity, Biopolitics*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- , 2013b. "Biopolitics." In *Biopolitics: A Reader*, edited by Timothy Campbell and Adam Sitze, Durham: Duke University Press.
- , 2015. *Persons and Things: From the Body's Point of View*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Forti, Simona. 2006. "The Biopolitics of Souls: Racism, Nazism, Plato." *Political Theory* Vol. 34, No. 1 (Feb.): 9-32.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- , 1990. *The History of Sexuality Volume 1*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- , 2003. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976*. New York: Picador.
- Gibson, Walter Murray. 1881. *Sanitary Instructions for Hawaiians in the English and Hawaiian Languages*. Honolulu: P.C. Advertiser Co.
- Goldberg-Hiller, Jonathan and Noenoe K Silva. 2011. "Sharks and Pigs: Animating Hawaiian Sovereignty against the Anthropological Machine." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 110:2, Spring 429-446
- Haraway, Donna J. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- The Holy Bible*, King James Version. 2000. New York: American Bible Society.
- Jensen, Lucia Tarallo and Natalie Mahina Jensen. 2005. *Nā Kaikamahine 'o Haumea: Daughters of Haumea Women of Ancient Hawai'i*. San Francisco: Pueo Press.
- Johnson, Rubellite Kawena. 2000. *The Kumulipo Mind: A Global Heritage in the Polynesian Creation Myth*. Honolulu.
- Kalākaua, David. "Personal Papers & Journal" MSMC Kalakaua. Honolulu: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.
- Kalākaua, David. "Scrapbook" 2.FMC 6.1. Honolulu: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.
- Kamakau, Samuel M. *Ke Aupuni Mo 'i*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2001.
- Kame'elehiwa, Lilikalā. 1992. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Kaowili, Helen K. 2012. *Ka Baibala Hemolele*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.
- Kikilo'i, Kekuēwa. 2010. "Rebirth of An Archipelago: Sustaining a Hawaiian Cultural Identity for People and Homeland," *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* Vol. 6: 73-115.
- , 2012. *Kūkulu Manamana: Ritual Power and Religious Expansion in Hawai'i the Ethno-historical and Archaeological Study of Mokumanamana and Nihoa Islands*. Ph.D. diss., University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Kuykendall, Ralph S. 1967. *A History of the Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 3* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Lemke, Thomas. 2011. *Bio-Politics: An Advanced Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lemm, Vanessa. 2009. *Nietzsche's Animal Philosophy*. Bronx: Fordham University Press.
- Malo, Davida. 2006. *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*. Translated by Malcolm Nāea Chun. Edited by Malcolm Nāea Chun. Honolulu: First People's Publications.
- McDougall, Brandy Nālani. 2016. *Finding Meaning: Kaona and Contemporary Hawaiian Literature*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- McWhorter, Ladelle. 2004. "Sex, Race, and Biopower: A Foucauldian Genealogy." *Hypatia* 19: 38-62.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2015. "Sylvia Wynter: What Does It Mean To Be Human?" In *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*, edited by Katherine McKittrick, 106-123. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. "Imagining the Good Indigenous Citizen: Race War and the Pathology of Patriarchal White Sovereignty." *Cultural Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2011): 61-79.
- Nadesan, Majia Holmer. 2011. *Governmentality, Biopower, and Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Neyrat, Frederic. 2010. "The Birth of Immunopolitics" *Parrhesia* no. 10: 31-38.
- Nogelmeier, M. Puakea 2010. *Mai Pa'a I Ka Leo: Historical Voice In Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward And Listening Back*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Oliveira, Katrina-Ann R. Kapā'anaokālāokeola Nākoa. 2014. *Ancestral Places: Understanding Kanaka Geographies*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole. 2002. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Papa Kuauhau Alii o na Alii Hawaii. 1884. *Hoike a ka Papa Kuauhau o na Alii Hawaii*. Honolulu: Ka Papa Kuauhau Alii o na Alii Hawaii.
- Poepoe, Joseph M. 1906. "Ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko." *Ka Na'i Aupuni*. February 1 to November 29.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2016. *Geontologies: A Requiem To Late Liberalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena. *n.d.* "How Legends Were Taught." Hawaiian Ethnographic Notes. Honolulu: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.
- , 1983. *Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs & Poetical Sayings*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel Elbert. 1986. *Hawaiian Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, E.W. Haertig, and Catherine A. Lee. 1972. *Nānā i ke Kumu vol. I and II*. Honolulu: Hui Hānai.

- Schweizer, Niklaus R. *Turning Tide: The Ebb and Flow of Hawaiian Nationality*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Silva, Noenoe K. 2004. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Simpson, Leanne. 2011. *Dancing On Our Turtle's Back*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Stannard, David E. 1989. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.
- Stewart, Charles S. 1970. *Journal of a Residence in the Sandwich Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press for Friends of the Library of Hawai'i.
- Stoler, Ann L. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's "History of Sexuality" and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tsai, Tiffany Lani Ing. 2014. "He Kā Waiho Ho'ohemahema: Kanaka Maoli Responses to King Kalākaua's Tour of the Kingdom from 1874 Newspapers in Hawai'i." *The Hawaiian Journal of History*. Vol. 48: 115-143.
- Vatter, Miguel. 2014. *The Republic of the Living: Biopolitics and the Critique of Civil Society*. Bronx: Fordham University Press.
- Weheliye, Alexander G. 2014. *Habeus Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Williams, Ronald C. 2013. *Claiming Christianity: The Struggle Over God and Nation in Hawai'i, 1880-1891*. Ph.D. diss., University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Wolfe, Cary. 2013. *Before the Law: Humans and Other Animals in a Biopolitical Frame*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.